HAND-BOOKS
FOR
BIBLE CLASSES
AND PRIVATE STUDENTS

GALATIANS

BY
Prof. James Macgregor, D.D.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK

227.4

John Newport

Handbooks for Bible Classes.

EDITED BY

REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.,

AND

REV. ALEXANDER WHYTE, M.A.

NOW READY.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. *Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*
By JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., Edinburgh.

THE POST-EXILIAN PROPHETS. With Introductions and Notes. *Price* 2*s.* By MARCUS DODS, D.D., Glasgow.

A LIFE OF CHRIST. *Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*
By Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A., Kirkcaldy.

THE SACRAMENTS. *Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*
By Rev. Professor CANDLISH, D.D., Glasgow.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES. *Price* 1*s.* 6*d.*
By Rev. Professor MURPHY, LL.D., Belfast.

IN PREPARATION.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. With Introduction and Notes.
By Rev. MARCUS DODS, D.D., Glasgow.

THE BOOKS OF JOSHUA AND JUDGES.
By Rev. Principal DOUGLAS, D.D., Glasgow.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.
By Rev. Professor BINNIE, D.D., Aberdeen.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.
By Rev. Professor SALMOND, Aberdeen.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.
By Rev. GEORGE REITH, M.A., Glasgow.

THE BOOK OF ACTS.
By Rev. GEORGE WEBSTER THOMSON, M.A., Glasgow.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.
By Rev. Principal BROWN, D.D., Aberdeen.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.
By Rev. JAMES MELLIS, M.A., Southport.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.
By Rev. SIMEON R. MACPHAIL, M.A., Glasgow.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.
By Rev. Professor DAVIDSON, D.D., Edinburgh.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN.
By Rev. Professor SALMOND, Aberdeen.

THE CHURCH.
By Rev. Professor BINNIE, D.D., Aberdeen.

THE CONFESSION OF FAITH. [*Shortly.*]
By Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., Findhorn.

THE REFORMATION. [*Shortly.*]
By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH. [*Shortly.*]
By Rev. N. L. WALKER, M.A., Dysart.

THE SHORTER CATECHISM.
By Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, M.A., Edinburgh.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.
By Rev. Professor MACGREGOR, D.D., Edinburgh.

CHURCH AND STATE.
By A. TAYLOR INNES, Esq., Advocate, Edinburgh.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.
By Rev. Professor LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow.

A LIFE OF ST. PAUL.
By Rev. JAMES STALKER, M.A., Kirkcaldy.

221.1
A2

HANDBOOKS

FOR

BIBLE CLASSES.

EDITED BY

REV. MARCUS DODS, D.D.,

AND

REV. ALEXANDER WHYTE, M.A.

John Newport

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1881.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

With Introduction and Notes

BY THE

REV. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

SECOND EDITION.

SEVENTH THOUSAND.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1881.

PREFATORY NOTE.

IT has long been felt by some of those whose business it is to teach "Bible classes,"—whether in the church, the school, or the family,—that their work might be greatly assisted could they direct their pupils to suitable text-books. But although in every other branch of education there is an abundance of manuals suitable for primary and secondary instruction, and prepared by men who are recognised authorities in their respective departments, the immense stores of Biblical learning which have now been accumulated have not been made accessible to the young scholar. The present enterprise—which was projected before any similar series was announced—is an attempt to put within the reach of the average pupil in our Bible classes a sufficient amount of information on Biblical and religious subjects. There is also reason to believe that such manuals will be welcomed by many private readers of Holy Scripture. The Editors consider themselves fortunate in securing the very hearty co-operation of men who are undoubtedly competent to carry out this idea.

M. D.
A. W.

INTRODUCTION.

I. Authorship.

THAT Paul wrote this Epistle is shown by the external evidence of manuscripts, of early translations, of allusions beginning with the apostolic fathers, of formal citations beginning with the sub-Apostolic Age, and of uniform reception by the church down from her first attempts at forming a canon of New Testament Scripture;—in short, by every kind of external evidence which the nature of the case admits of. It is shown, too, by internal evidence, which here is quite irresistible, not only in the harmony of the Epistle, as regards doctrine and other indications of authorship, both with what is elsewhere ascertainable about Paul and his writings, and with the more general history and characters of the Apostolic Age, but also and especially in the manifest impossibility that *this* Epistle should have been written by any man but Paul.

There was no period later than his lifetime in which any church party could have any interest in forging such an Epistle as this, or in which any section of the Christian church would have received such a forgery as genuine. And it may be safely said that, even in his lifetime, no creature could have written it but Paul, precisely in such a crisis—so fitted to call forth the characteristics of his utterance into almost exaggerated manifestation—as that which is implied in the Epistle throughout. Here we have, not only occasional indications of some features of his character, but the man himself, full-length all through, in one continuous rush—

a veritable torrent—of genuine and inimitable Paulinism, like a mountain-stream in full flood, such as may often have been seen by his Galatians.

Of counter evidence there is not so much as an appearance; and accordingly there never has been any denial worth attending to. That Tübingen School which has gone farthest on proper grounds of historical criticism in the endeavour to discredit the genuineness of New Testament writings, has recognised as indisputable the genuineness of this Epistle, as well as of the three—First and Second Corinthians and Romans—to which it is theologically most nearly akin. No critic worthy of the name has ever seriously called its genuineness in question. In short, that Paul wrote this Epistle is, on proper grounds of evidence, as certain as that Martin Luther wrote a commentary on it, or that Lord Macaulay wrote a history of England.

The text is remarkably pure, so that any emendations proposed on appropriate grounds would not, if introduced into our authorized version, catch the eye of an educated English reader; nor, if pointed out, appear to affect the sense of any sentence in a degree that would be regarded by him as material. We have thus an indisputably genuine antique,—to us as unquestionably an authentic utterance of Paul as if we had been looking over his shoulder when (vi. 11) he was writing "with his own hand." And the fact thus clear suggests some considerations worth attending to here at the outset:—

1. Such a picture as this of Paul himself is a veritable treasure. Effectively he has been one of the greatest of the sons of men: his influence upon the world's history, from his day to ours, in all most vital respects, has probably not been surpassed, if equalled, by that of any other in human form, excepting Him who is the Eternal Son of God. Besides, he is perhaps the most interesting personage in human history; for of his Master we may not speak as interesting, since He is adorable. And the unconscious delineation of that character, so powerful and interesting, is in the present Epistle curiously vivid and complete. The trenchant force of majestic King Saul, David's transcendentalism of piety and of valour "in battle keen," Jonathan's heroic tenderness without his passionate

melancholy, and a certain magnanimous cheerfulness not completely suppressed even by the sorest reverses most keenly felt, all reveal themselves together in a combination which can be described only as Pauline; and reveal themselves all the more clearly, in their harmony of contrast, just because we see him here only as for an instant, as in the light of a lightning-flash, in the agony of battle for his religion, for his Lord, for the dear life of those Galatians he has loved so dearly. His rabbinism, which he can play with to good purpose after he has far outgrown it; his copious employment of the Old Testament for the refutation of Judaism on its own ground; his self-manifestations, even when battling against the circumcision, as "an Hebrew of the Hebrews," who has served God "from his forefathers;" his inextricable whirls of composition, disregarding grammar and torturing criticism in the impetuous torrent of his eloquence;—these are secondary and circumstantial traits, which add pathetic interest to details when observed in the leisure of close study. But, even through these, what we mainly see is the man himself as he was, and loved, and laboured, and agonized, and fought "the noble fight of the faith." Even as a picture of Paul the magnanimous, this Epistle is an inestimable gem.

2. To evangelical Protestants the Epistle is peculiarly precious as a monument of their doctrine of justification by faith. Well might Luther call it his "Catharine Bora." It would be worse than idle for one proposing to expound the Epistle to conceal his view, if he have a definite view, of its doctrine. For on the face of it, it is doctrinal or nothing; it plainly is a battle for a theological proposition affecting the very foundation of Christian life in God. And the present writer is fully persuaded that the doctrine battled for is the Protestant doctrine of justification. After carefully weighing every sentence and clause in it, he has an unhesitating and settled conviction, not only that that doctrine is taught in the Epistle, but that, theologically, the whole Epistle is a battle for that doctrine, and for nothing else. He therefore regards the Epistle as entitled to peculiar fulness of affectionate appreciation on the part of evangelical Protestants, because it is a monumental trophy of a victory won for their fundamental doctrine by the greatest of apostles.

3. Not only all Christians, but all men, especially in our time, have a deep interest in the fact that such an Epistle has come down to us unquestionably from the hand of Paul the Apostle, because in it we have both a monument of primitive Christianity and an evidence of the truth and divinity of Christianity. In our time many are exercised about the genuineness and authenticity of Scripture. Not a few are so exercised by doubts about this as to be shaken in their faith. Let us, then, consider how much is involved, for the establishment of the faith, in the fact that this one Epistle—to say nothing of Romans and First and Second Corinthians—is unquestionably Paul's.

The complete Scripture record is very important for the perpetuation of our faith: while divine inspiration, making the books to be properly oracular, makes our study of them to be properly a religious exercise, the record secures continued knowledge of our religion in its pure primitive form. But the complete Scripture record is not strictly necessary for demonstration of the truth of our religion, nor even for our instruction regarding the substance of its truths. The substance of its truths, so far as to suffice—really though not amply—for "doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness," is set forth or implied in this Epistle, though it had been the only surviving fragment of writing professedly by evangelist or apostle. It sets forth with sufficient clearness the fundamental catholic doctrines of man's ruin through sin, constituting deadly bondage of guilt and depravity by nature; and of salvation by grace, free justification, new creation of heart and life, by "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost." And this it sets forth, not as a speculation of Paul's, nor as a tradition which he has received from men, but as by him received directly from God in Christ risen and glorified, and as attested by miracles of the Spirit of God, not only in the new spiritual life of believers, but in the shape of manifest interventions of supernatural power in the natural course of the world's history, before the eyes of men then living, some of whom would have been very well disposed to deny the alleged fact if they could. The conversion of Paul, if admitted as a real historical fact, has been justly appealed to as itself a demon-

stration of the truth of our religion. This Epistle, if received as genuine, while implying Paul's conversion so as to carry in its bosom that demonstration of the truth of Christianity, at the same time, in addition to further evidence of this truth, shows what in substance were the truths which in the first age were taught as from God by Christ's apostles and evangelists.

4. In the following notes under the head (III.) of "date," it will appear that the Epistle effectively serves for demolition of an infidel theory, of primitive Christian religion and literature, which, in the estimation of the theorisers, the Epistle warrants or supports.

II. Address.

"To the churches of Galatia" (literally, "of the Galatian land"). There was at this time a Roman province of Galatia, which may have nearly coincided with the Galatian land; but in the Epistle there is no trace of the Roman domination. The Epistle shows that in the churches of that land there were Jews: there were Jewish emissaries of the Judaical faction from without, and doubtless there were in Galatia, as in others of those eastern lands, native Jews of the dispersion—"Grecians" or Hellenists; but in the Epistle Jews are spoken of uniformly by way of contrast to the Galatians addressed, so that Gentiles no doubt constituted at least the great majority of those addressed here, so as to give character to the whole. Some primitive Oriental districts had by the Romans been amalgamated into one province with Galatia proper; and in the population of Galatia proper there probably had always remained an element of primitive Orientalism; but these were not in such a proportion to the whole population as to prevent it from being characteristically Galatian in name, and temperament, and blood, and language. Finally, there had early been so large an infusion of that Greek element which spread over the East after Alexander the Great, that at first the district was called Gallo-Graecia; but that had not overcome the strong individualism of the Galatian race, which, in the respects I have specified, continued to predominate in the formation of prevalent character

throughout the land long after Paul's time;—as Galatian character has long survived the infusion of various foreign elements in the Scottish Highlands, Wales, Ireland, and France. With the doubtful exception of one allusion (iv. 8) to the idolatry from which Christ had redeemed them, and which may have been tinged with the peculiar superstitions of the primitive races, there is nothing in the Epistle to suggest that Paul had any character in his view but what was native to the Galatians as thus marked out.

His Galatians are interesting to all men on this account, that they are the only Gentile *race* addressed in a God-inspired Scripture. The Greeks or Hellenes are in no Epistle addressed as a race. Even the "Romans" addressed in the greatest of all Epistles were not a race, but only a mixed multitude of nationalities in the imperial city. The only Gentile race addressed in any of our Scriptures are the Galatians. Further, they are peculiarly interesting to us, because they are claimed as kindred by the two leading races—the Teutonic and the Celtic—which are combined in the united kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland.

For a Teutonic origin of these Galatians nothing can be alleged that is not obviously the fond invention of the vanity of modern Teutons. Some names of persons and places look Teutonic, especially when seen through Teutonizing spectacles; and one of the three great divisions of the Asian-Celtic confederacy appears to have been in some way specially connected with Teutonism, as may well have been the case though even this division had been properly Celtic. But everything of real evidence, and of reasonable divination, attainable through language, institutions, manners, and temperament (strongly marked in this Epistle), and relative indications of ancient history, points to the conclusion that Paul's Galatians were properly Celtic in blood as well as name.

The name Galatians (*Galatae*), of which Celts (*Keltae*) was a more ancient form applied to all of Gaulish blood, has somewhat puzzled critics ignorant of Celtic language. "Why," they perplexedly ask, "not say Gauls (*Galli*), not Galatians?" Galatia (*Gaëldachd*) is the only name known by a Scotch Highlander for his own "land of the Gauls" (Gaels); while for Scotland at large he has no name but Albania (*Albanachd*), from Albion (which

he calls *Alba*), the ancient name of Britain. Galatia (Gaëldachd, as if Gaël*dom*) is simply the Gaul country, domain or land of the Gaels; and Galatae, or Celtae, the people of that land, is a secondary formation, by foreigners, from this name of the land. Observe that there never has been a king "of Scotland," nor emperor "of France." It is "of Scots," "of the French"—the people giving their own name to the land. Jerome, who had dwelt among European Gauls in his youth, and afterwards visited Asiatic Galatia, says that the original word Gaul itself was understood to be descriptive of fairness or blondness, characteristic of the Gauls in respect of skin and hair. This suggests *geal* ("white," whence *gealach*, "the white one," or "fair one," as proper name of the moon); and this *geal*, which is nearly the same in sound, is probably associated etymologically with the Teutonic *gelb* (pronounced "yelb," and anciently "yelv," whence our "yellow"). Jerome's etymological suggestion may thus be well-founded. Gaul, or Gael, may originally have meant the "white" or "blond:" Albion (near in form to yelb) has long been understood to mean "the white land."

The movement of Celts into Asia, about 280 B.C., was a sort of backward eddy of that great wave of Celtic migration which, after overspreading Gaul proper, had overflowed the Alps and the Pyrenees (witness *Gallia Cisalpina* and Spanish *Celtiberia*), had travelled south and east along the course of the Danube, and ravaged Northern Greece in a raid made ever memorable by the pillaging of Delphi. Those Gauls who then crossed into Asia, at first mere roving invaders, soon became mercenary soldiers, and by and bye settled down into a district allotted to them,—there are "soldiers' settlements" near Callander,—which is described as "bounded by Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Bithynia, and having as its chief cities Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium." It will be seen on the map that this district is a highland, embracing the head waters of the great streams of Asia Minor. Secure in their mountain fastnesses, the new-comers were troublesome neighbours, occasionally making forays far into the surrounding lowlands. Though tributary to local monarchs, they retained a certain rude freedom under their own chieftains, with a constitu-

tion not unlike that of the Swiss Cantons under the Hapsburgs. When overcome by the Romans, 189 B.C., they had far degenerated from that valour, and softened from that fierceness, which at one time had made them the terror of Upper Asia. But even after they became a Roman province, 26 B.C., they retained their Celtic tongue, with features of character markedly Celtic.

Though addressed by Paul in a Greek Epistle, they may have been preached to only in Celtic even by Paul. All over the civilized world knowledge of Greek was then, far more than knowledge of French is now in Europe, an accomplishment of a gentleman; so that the leading men in the Galatian churches would be able to understand a Greek letter, as leading men in the Outer Hebrides can understand an English letter,—such as may be sent to the churches of Long Island by the General Assembly. But no minister who can speak Gaelic will think of preaching there in anything but Gaelic, the language of the people, which alone they can take in with ease and pleasure. Now we are informed by Jerome that the Galatians spoke their own original tongue when he visited them, four hundred years after they had listened to Paul. (The *second* of his prefaces to his *Commentary on Gal.*)

Irenaeus, in the preface to his great work on *Heresies*, apologises for the rustiness of his Greek on the ground that he has long been in familiar use only of the language of the Celts. Greek must have been well known to many inhabitants of his district, whose chief city, Marseilles, was reckoned almost a Greek city, and Latin to many more, witness the very name of the district, *Provincia* (Provence). But Celtic was the common language of the people there. It is the plan of Providence for the diffusion of the gospel that the peoples should everywhere, so far as practicable, hear in "their own" respective "tongues the great things of God." A people's "own tongue," the mother tongue, the language of home, fragrant with memories of home and of childhood with its wondering delights, has for the purposes of popular instruction and impression an inimitable power; especially when that tongue—like Greek, Hebrew, German, Celtic—is one of those original or uncompounded tongues in which almost every word

has a picture for the imagination and a song for the heart. Hence Irenaeus, learned Oriental though he was, in his pastoral labours would use only the language of the Celts. Hence our missionaries labour to attain free use of the mother tongues of heathenism. Hence the Pentecostal effusion, of preparation for the grand campaign, was characterised by a miraculous gift of tongues. And there seems to be no good reason to regard as chimerical the suggestion that Paul for preaching purposes may have used the gift in Galatia.

That suggestion, however, though it may be in some respects profitable as well as pleasing to play with it for a little, will not aid us in understanding the Epistle, except, perhaps, by indenting on our minds the fact that those addressed are Galatians, or Asiatic Celts. More serviceable is what is known of their distinctive character. The character of the Galatians, as revealed in this Epistle, curiously corresponds with notices found in ancient Pagan writers of the character of European Gauls, and with what is known of the character of Celtic races in mediæval and modern Christendom.

The Celts have been described as warm, impetuous, affectionate, generous, invested with "the fatal gift of fascination." So Paul seems to have found them. His first visit (Acts xvi. 6; Gal. iv. 13) appears to have been occasioned by illness, probably a painful infirmity of the eyes, constraining him to turn aside from the main course of his labours in search of restorative repose. This eddy or side-stream of his life proved more powerful than the main stream of other lives. From the date of that visit there was in Galatia a church, including churches, of God in Christ. It is not quite certain that no one was there before him with the gospel. At least he was the true human father of the Galatian church; indeed, he expressly claims (Gal. iv. 19) to have been both father and mother to her members. They appear to have been to him more humanly interesting than any other community evangelized by him. His feeling towards them is passionate affection. They are his "little children," his darlings, even when far from being his crown and his joy. His expostulations, his rebukes, his awful curses against false teachers, are the outcries of an affection truly

passionate, on the part of a strong man who sees his winning and beautiful babe in imminent peril of death. And this feeling on his part reflects what he had at first experienced from them. They received him with enthusiasm, not despising his infirmity, but divining the hero through his weakness, and perhaps loving him the more tenderly because he had weakness like other men of mortal mould. They formed towards him a passionate affection, as if fascinated by him before practising their "gift of fascination" upon him.

On the other hand, the Gauls as a race have been characterised as peculiarly addicted to certain vices, in a manner which would throw light on some features of this Epistle. For example, among those vices are certain gross lusts of the flesh, which have a place of prominence in the practical part of this Epistle (v. 19–21) more marked than in the parallel catalogues in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians (Rom. i. 29, 30; 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21). Also, and especially, they have been described as peculiarly fickle and vain. Thus Cæsar (*Bell. Gal.* iv. 5) on one occasion shrank from committing himself by treaty to some Celts of Gaul, avowedly on account of the fickleness of the race; and Livy (*Hist.* x. 28) makes a Roman general arrange his tactic on the view that they were valiant like men in the assault of battle, but were characterised by a womanlike lack of pertinacious force if the first shock of their assault were successfully resisted. And their vanity, as often is the case with valiant races or individuals, was as conspicuous as their valour; a modern author (Thierry), in a *History of the Gauls*, makes vanity to have been the fatal weakness, which has rendered fruitless many fine qualities in their natural character. Fickleness, so great as to be astonishing, is in the forefront of this Epistle (i. 6) described, by the greatest man that ever knew and loved a Celtic race, as having characterised their bearing, even toward God in the gospel. And this fickleness of theirs was one aspect or result of vanity.

That vanity is very impressively set forth in chap. iii. 1. "Foolish Galatians" does not mean "stupid." The Celtic race is characteristically clever or talented: "the great nation" of France, fundamentally Celtic, is perhaps the most talented of

nations, and at least is splendidly gifted in respect of comprehension and exposition. The word "foolish" here means bereaved of *nous*, or of practical sense—"demented;" so far a good translation would be the Scottish word "daft." Through want of sense, or "daftness," in relation to spiritual things, they were exposed to "witchery," or fascination, assailing them on their weak side, for the purpose of leading them away from the true foundation of life in God. And that thing in them, which laid them open to the fatal fascination, was vanity.

Vanity in the Epistle presents two aspects: 1. A childish, and almost brutish, delight in what fills the eye or the sensuous imagination, *e.g.* a ritualistic form of religion; and, 2. silly self-conceit, which even in religion asserts itself by claiming for one's own goodness or good works a place and power as ground of acceptance with God. The childish, or peacock-like, vanity, in relation even to religion, may to the Galatians have at first found gratification in their Pagan religion; for the ancient Gauls are described as having been excessively devoted to religious observances, and their Druidical system was well fitted to attract the eye and imagination with a fascination at least of horror. And the Galatians may thus, even by their previous religious training, have had formed in them, on the basis of their natural vanity, a predisposition towards that Judaism, opposed by Paul in this Epistle, which, while characteristically addressing itself to the eye, to sensuous imagination, at the same time ministered to silly self-conceit, by proceeding on the theological ground, relatively to justification before God, that man can work out a righteousness of his own by external conformity to law.

It is a striking fact that these Galatians, after having served as an illustrative sample of silly self-conceit in religion, disappear from church history until long after the time of the apostles. At a later period in primitive church history, their district was noted for origination of various heresies, some of which—*e.g.* the Montanist—evinced the operation, not only of silly self-conceit, but of a certain liability or predisposition to "witchery" or fascination of *falsetto* supernaturalism. In the Western church of that period a Celt (*Pelagius*, or Morgan) was the great apostle of self-

conceit in theology; and in the Middle Ages a Celt (*Duns Scotus, i.e.* Duns of Ireland) was perhaps the best sample of the scholastic theology of self-conceit or scholastic anti-evangelism. And it is noteworthy that at this hour the grand Apostasy, whose theological ground is self-conceit while its working system is showy and sensuous, has its most devoted adherents (blindly devoted, "foolish," "bewitched") in the Celts of Ireland and Brittany. On the other hand, we mark the perfervid evangelism of Celts in Wales and the Scottish Highlands. They represent the fever-heat of the Galatian church, while their cousins beyond sea represent its fever-chill, the revulsion to an opposite extreme. And in the religious history of them, as well as of their cousins, there may be found curiously interesting indications of a natural temperament tending to extremes of fever-heat or fever-chill, and swiftly passing from the one extreme to the other.

Unauthentic history, or vague unaccredited tradition, may suggest the not unpleasing thought that the Galatian church, though disappearing from the records of the new kingdom, may have contributed to its progress. That progress was markedly rapid and great among Celts. Irenaeus, in a letter to the churches of Smyrna and Asia generally, about a persecution of the Celtic church of Lyons and Vienne, *circa* A.D. 171, describes a state of things implying that Christianity must then have been rooted in that district for some time. Not long after, Tertullian boasts that in (then Celtic) Britain Christ has gone with His gospel farther than the Romans have been able to penetrate with fire and sword. This places a widespread Celtic Christianity within a lifetime of the apostles: Irenaeus was a pupil of Polycarp of Smyrna, who had sat at the feet of John the Divine. The Celtic churches (*e.g.* of the Scottish Culdees) long continued to retain some traces of Orientalism of origin, pointing towards Asia Minor as the source of Celtic evangelization. And the heart as well as the imagination is gratified by the suggestion thus arising, that the Galatian churches may have sent the gospel to the Celts of Europe. We learn from Jerome that in his day their spoken language was in substance what was spoken by the Treviri—European Celts of Trêves. There is a vague tradition about a mysterious visitor who came to Britain

with the gospel, round by the Straits of Gibraltar from the Mediterranean Sea. May not this mysterious visitor have been a Christian of Galatia, perhaps a convert of Paul and a student of this Epistle, who, driven by persecution or constrained by love of Christ, bore the gospel from a Celtic land near the cradle of mankind, and preached it in the mother-tongue to that Britain which was the then recognised motherland of the Celts?

III. DATE.

Regarding the date of this Epistle there has been difference of opinion, affecting not unimportant matters of Bible history and doctrine. Some make it to be the earliest of Paul's Epistles; others the latest; while the great mass of inquirers have placed it somewhat late in his ministry, soon after his second visit to Galatia (Acts xviii. 23; Gal. i. 9?), either towards the close of his long residence in Ephesus, or during a later period, when he was labouring in the north of Greece, about the time between his second Epistle to the Corinthians and his Epistle to the Romans.

The supposition that this Epistle was his first, or at least that it was written before the synod of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), has been favoured by some critics who wish to show that the book of the Acts is not authentic history. In their judgment the supposition would show that that book is really a party pamphlet, written for the dishonest purpose of concealing a serious difference in religion which had early broken out between Paul and the other apostles with their respective adherents, a difference of which this Epistle is a monument, and which the Jerusalem synod soldered up. Supposing that judgment of theirs to be well founded, we can reason from it to an opposite conclusion, viz. that the Epistle must have been written after that synod met; because the history in the Acts is demonstrably true, and consequently any supposition inconsistent with its truth must be mistaken. And in fact Paul himself, in the narrative part of this Epistle, so far from intimating that there was at the time any difference theologically between him and the earlier apostles, contends that from the outset there had been no

difference between his gospel and theirs, and appeals to the fact that this had been formally owned by them when he first had occasion to compare his own teaching with theirs. At a later period, he tells us, he had occasion to rebuke one of them (Peter) for a practice which he (Paul) deemed unworthy of an apostle; but the very ground of his rebuke was, not that this practice was dictated by a mistaken theological doctrine held by the earlier apostles, but that it was condemned by the doctrine held and professed by all the apostles in common, and was inconsistent with the practice which, on the ground of that doctrine, had been recommended and exemplified by Peter as well as Paul.

Again, the supposition has been favoured on account of the support it would give to an infidel theory of the whole history and literature of the New Testament Church in the Apostolic Age. It is maintained that in this literature there is evidence of four theological stages, involving at one stage a real theological collision between Paul and the earlier apostles: the first stage, when the circumcision party had it all their own way; the second, represented by this Epistle, when the collision was open and flagrant; the third, represented by various scriptures of the Apostolic Age, in which there was an attempt at reconciliation between Paulinism and Judaism; and the fourth, in which the triumph of Paulinism was complete and definitive, represented by scriptures, some of them belonging to our canon, which really are not apostolic in authorship or date. This theory is demolished by the plain fact, which Paul makes a leading part of his contention in this Epistle, when many who knew the facts would have been eager to contradict him if they could, that there was not then, and there never had been, any such collision as the theory presupposes. And here, again, the judgment of the theorisers (that a very early date of the Epistle would favour their theory) can be turned against the supposition of a very early date; for that supposition must be mistaken which demands or really supports an infidel view of the history and literature of the Apostolic Age.

But among men who have no thought of disparaging apostolic teaching or writing, some have contended for an early date on internal grounds, partly of the style of this Epistle as compared

with that of others, partly of a certain elementariness in Paul's teaching here as compared with his teaching elsewhere.

His literary style, they allege, is here comparatively rugged and harsh, as if he had been only beginning to write in Greek, and had not attained to the comparative fluency and ease of his writings confessedly late. Now this criterion of style for determining date is very precarious. A man who has one fundamental style, pervading all his writings, may have as many varieties of style as he has varying moods and tenses of feeling; so much so that two compositions, one perhaps an elaborate treatise and the other a sharp expostulation or passionate appeal, though written in one week or in one day, may appear as if belonging to widely separate periods of his life. Again, there is no reason to suppose that Paul, at any period of his ministry, can have had any such difficulty in writing Greek as to occasion peculiar ruggedness or harshness: from his boyhood upward he was, we may presume, familiar with that language, like any other studious son of a well-conditioned citizen of Tarsus the learned. And finally, in fact, those other compositions of his—the pastoral Epistles—which most nearly resemble this Epistle in respect of ruggedness and harshness, are precisely those which cannot have been of any date before the very latest period of his career.

The circumstance that the teaching here is comparatively elementary does not warrant the conclusion that the authorship must be correspondingly early in point of time. It may imply only—what one can see to have been a fact—that that elementary instruction is what was needed at the time by the community addressed; that they were lapsing from the elements of gospel truth, and consequently needed to have those elements set forth and enforced with simplicity and power. One of the greatest masters of this and kindred branches of sacred learning (Dr. Lightfoot) has, notwithstanding elementariness in form, found in the substance of Paul's teaching here so much of significant coincidence with his teaching in the comparatively late epistles to the Corinthians (Second) and to the Romans, as in his estimation to warrant the inference that all three must have been written very nearly at the same time, when Paul's mind was more full than at any other time of the

subject he discusses with the Galatians. And, notwithstanding elementariness, the supposition of a comparatively late date appears to be warranted, if not in truth necessitated, by what the Epistle discloses of the then condition of mind in the Galatian churches.

The Galatians addressed here are manifestly in a second or a third stage of religious history. Though they had been only in the first, they might have long been in the faith. In the natural world, the life in one region may belong logically to a late period, while in another the life existing at the same time belongs logically to an early period: the indigenous fauna and flora of America is older than that of Europe, and that of Australasia is older than that of America. Similarly in the spiritual world and life: in Britain at this hour there are districts whose type of thought and feeling is substantially that of the Reformation time, and others in which the type has remained mediæval, while in others the type is recent in a good sense or a bad. Thus Galatia might have been long in the faith, though its present condition had been simply that assumed by Christian communities when first formed by the gospel. But in fact the Galatians are in a second stage, if not a third. They not only have received the gospel, and gone on to reflect on its doctrinal contents, but after being theologians have become heretics, so that the apostle's "Ye did run well" is a dismal dirge over a comparatively remote past. The fever-heat has had time to be followed by the fever-chill—over a wide region.

The fact that this condition has at least partly been brought about by emissaries from the outside really strengthens the present argument for a late period. It is of course abstractly conceivable that zealots for circumcision should have sent emissaries on the track of Paul before the synod of Jerusalem. But it is extremely unlikely that the faction, occupied with the faction-fight at home, and that, too, against Peter, on account of his procedure in the case of Cornelius, should have so early gone with their machinations as far as Galatia. Further, their Judaism in Galatia has assumed a virulent form, apparently in advance, on an evil way, of that which had prevailed before the famous synod met; so that the evil seed must have had time to ripen into the completed fruit which we have under observation here. The invasion by

those emissaries, though conceivable at an early date, really constitutes a strong presumption in favour of the later date.

The expression, "so soon," in i. 6, has been appealed to as in itself conclusive for a very early date. But this "so soon" may mean, not after Paul's first visit to Galatia, but after his second visit, apparently referred to in i. 9, when he warned them against apostasy, as if a danger of it had then begun to appear. And though it had referred to their first receiving of the gospel, the expression would have been warrantable and natural on the supposition of a later date ; for apostasy from faith, such as their faith had been, so enthusiastic and flourishing, within the few years implied in a later date, would have been soon, marvellously soon, in the religious lifetime of a community. But in fact it is not necessary to suppose that the expression refers to date or duration of time at all : it may refer simply to manner—to swiftness, abruptness, or suddenness—of apostasy.

Against the later date there have been alleged some external notes of time in connection with Paul's second visit to Jerusalem mentioned in the Epistle (ii. 1). It is assumed that if this second visit be different from that described in Acts xv., then the Epistle must have been written before the Jerusalem synod, or that the second visit of Galatians must of course have been the second of Acts (xi. 27–30). The assumption is mistaken ; for the second Galatian visit may conceivably have been one not mentioned anywhere in Acts. But that it is the one described in Acts xv. has been the prevalent opinion of Christian scholars from Irenaeus downwards. And it is not difficult to show that at least the alleged external notes of time are not conclusive against that opinion.

1st Objection :—The Epistle makes no (other) mention of that visit, which is second in the Acts (xi. 27–30), when Paul went to Jerusalem with alms for his nation. *Answer* :—The Epistle has no occasion to refer to that visit, being concerned only with those which illustrate Paul's relative independence as an apostle, who has received the gospel straight from God.

2d Objection :—To the synod he went by delegation from the Christians of Antioch (Acts xv. 2), while the second Galatian visit was "by revelation" (Gal. ii. 2). *Answer* :—Both things

may hold good of one and the same visit. If the Antiochians understood he was going by revelation, they may have chosen him as their delegate on that very account. If they chose him without such knowledge, he may have consulted the Lord, and obtained a revelation authorizing and instructing him to accept their appointment (comp. Acts xvi. 9, 10). Or the election and the revelation may have been quite independent each of the other.

3*d Objection*:—In Acts we read that he went along with Barnabas, while in Galatians we read also of Titus as accompanying him. *Answer*:—The Acts have no occasion to make special mention of Titus, and in Galatians there is special occasion to make mention of Titus alone. The case of Titus alone is a case in point to show what Paul here is maintaining, that the earlier apostles did not make circumcision obligatory on Gentile converts, and that Paul did not own any such obligation, even in the most tempting circumstances.

4*th Objection*:—Among the leaders at Jerusalem John is not mentioned in the history, while he is mentioned in the Epistle. *Answer*:—As above. The history mentions only those, of whom John was not one, who took part in the public proceedings of synod. The Epistle mentions those, of whom John was one, with whom Paul conferred as recognised leaders or pillars.

5*th Objection*:—The proceedings described in Acts xv. are not the proceedings described in Gal. ii. *Answer*:—They could not be. Those described in the history are manifestly synodical and public. Those described in the Epistle are manifestly private and confidential. But why did not Paul then and there set forth in public meeting what he maintained in private conference? Perhaps we do not know, and certainly we do not need to know. But, *first*, private conference among leaders, not reported in public at the time, is quite a common incident in connection with important public meetings. *Second*, Paul may not have chosen to debate in the public meeting, because in a sense he was a "party at the bar." And *third*, apparently the question debated in public was not really the question conferred upon in private: the former was properly a question of discipline (dependent on doctrine), the latter was the

far more important question of doctrine (involving much more than this one matter of discipline).

6th Objection:—The Epistle does not appeal to the synod's decision or decrees. *Answer*:—Paul nowhere in his Epistles appeals to that decision. And in this Epistle it is natural that he should not depart from his custom of thus openly maintaining a relative independence; for the assertion of that independence is here and now an important part of his contention.

7th Objection:—But if the Jerusalem synod was before the visit of Peter to Antioch (Gal. ii. 11–14), then Peter's action there must have been grossly inconsistent with his real convictions. *Answer*:—So it was. So Paul affirmed that it was. So it must have been if the visit to Antioch was at any time later than the conversion of Cornelius. And in Peter's case such gross inconsistency was not a new thing: witness his denial of Christ *in extremis*.

Objections being thus disposed of, let us take a parting view of the position at the later date supposed as established. I have said that the Jerusalem synod did not, formally and expressly, pronounce upon the theological question now discussed by Paul. They only declared generally that, beyond some details of evanescent significance, the ceremonial law was not obligatory on all Christians. They did not forbid conformity to that law, and Paul himself, on some occasions, practised conformity (Acts xvi. 1–3). But some of the Judaisers had from the outset maintained that the conformity is indispensable to salvation (Acts xv. 1). The decision of synod left them a liberty, which as a class they did not fail to take, of making much of the conformity, and pressing it on others as very important. Their movement had for some considerable time extended as far as Galatia, and their pressure there had apparently (Gal. vi. 12) assumed the form of a moral compulsion, such as the Gentile Christians had been subjected to at Antioch on the part of Peter and other Jews. Their superstition, thus swelling in dimensions, had come to be animated with a really anti-Christian spirit. For there had come to work in their minds the question, But why? Why should we regard circumcision as obligatory, law-works as necessary to salvation? And the answer had risen in their hearts if not to their lips, Because such works are a ground

—at least a supplementary ground—of justification before God. Thus the gospel was being "subverted" from the very foundation. And as Paul, while remarkably tolerant in relation to the conformity, was notoriously a strenuous opponent of this new anti-evangelical doctrine, they had come in relation to him, as the Corinthians came on a kindred though different account, to act like the swine in the parable (Matt. vii. 6), though with more of coherent reason; assailing his person and office because they could not otherwise withstand his doctrine. Then he drew sword.

IV. Contents.

The purpose of this Epistle has been described as twofold—to defend Paul's apostleship, and to defend his gospel. That description is not a good one; for it makes the Epistle into two, while really it is one. Paul's one purpose manifestly is to remedy or prevent the ruinous evil resulting to the Galatians from the success of the Judaising movement among them. For this end, the one great means he employs is defence of the doctrine of justification by faith, as what is proving to be the real matter in this debate for their true life or death. Having his purpose thus in view, we are able to define more precisely the three parts into which the Epistle is naturally divided, and which are vaguely described as historical, theological, and practical. In relation to justification by faith, these three parts are represented by the words—*position, demonstration, application.* The first part, chaps. i., ii., defines the position. The second part, chaps. iii., iv., contains the demonstration. And the third part, chaps. v., vi., is occupied with a practical application, which manifestly at first, and really on to the last, springs out of the position made good by the demonstration.

No one of these parts can be understood by one who has not a clear conception of the doctrine thus introduced, defended, and applied. For it pervades the Epistle throughout, as the soul pervades the body, "all in the whole, and all in every part." In order, therefore, to a real introduction to the contents, I have thrown into an appendix to this section some notes on the doctrine as here discussed, and on the leading words here employed in the

discussion of it. These notes ought perhaps to be read before the following outline of contents of the Epistle; for the outline will find in the notes at once illustration and justification.

Outline of Contents :—

I. THE POSITION, i., ii., relatively to the controversy in hand.

1. *The salutation*, i. 1–4, which has not Paul's customary expression of congratulatory praise or thanks, is further specially significant by its assertion (ver. 1) of his independent apostleship, implying that he has right to speak with authority here and now, and (ver. 4) by his manner of describing the redeeming work of God in Christ, implying that the Judaisers are in their present contention setting themselves against the doctrine of grace.

2. 6–10. *Expansion* of what is thus intimated in ver. 4. The Galatians are lapsing from God in the gospel. Those who seduce them to this are under the curse of God. Paul has previously spoken to this effect, and he is not now disposed to resile.

3. 11–24. *Expansion* of what is intimated in ver. 1. Paul has not received his office nor his doctrine from man. Before his conversion he could not receive anything from Christians. At and after his conversion he received both doctrine and office direct from God. It was not till a number of years after that he so much as saw the face of another apostle; and when he did see him he did not so much as appear to receive from him either authorization or information qualifying for office. After that he was for many long years a stranger to Jerusalem, the seat of the older apostles, though known about by the Christians of Judea.

4. ii. 1–10. *Further proof* of what is thus far expanded in i. 11–24. The second visit to Jerusalem. Not called thither by the earlier apostles, but sent of God, in the common interest, to consult with leaders there. There there was not required of him so much as the slightest formal concession to the circumcision party. The leaders conferred nothing on him, and did not pretend to confer anything on him. On the contrary, they owned him as ordained and sealed of God, independently of them, with a special charge of the evangelization of the Gentiles, and formally fraternised with him and covenanted with him as in all respects their equal.

5. 11–14. *Illustration* of what has been thus proved. Dealing with Peter at Antioch shows that Paul persistently maintained, without challenge, his authority as apostle,—witness his rebuking the disingenuous inconsistency of one then recognised as at least among the three highest leaders representing the older apostles.

6. 15–21. *Enunciation* of the doctrinal position hinted at in ver. 4. It lies at the root, the living foundation, of all Christian life. It involves death to the law, in order to life unto God. It involves, more particularly, death along with Christ on the cross, which is accompanied or followed by life of

Christ in us, a life lived by believing on Him as Emmanuel dead for us in self-sacrificing love. And it thus forbids the crime of those who will have a righteousness of law, and so in effect reject the grace of God, and make Emmanuel's death a thing of nought.

II. The Demonstration, iii., iv., of the doctrine in question.

1. iii. 1–5. *Experience* of the Galatians themselves. Christ crucified is what has been set before them as the grand object of faith. It is the doctrine of faith in Him that was sealed of God by gifts and graces of the Spirit at the outset of their new life, and that continues to be attested by miracles.

   Then follows the argument on Scripture ground, especially as coming home to zealots for Judaism.

2. 7–14. *Abraham's case,* of justification by faith, is the typical case; so that all his true children are justified by faith, not by works of the law. The law, as covenant of works, has for those who trust in it not a blessing but a curse, the curse from which Christ has redeemed us by undergoing it in our stead; so that all Christians, Gentiles included, are by Him brought into Abraham's position of faith, not works.

3. 15–18. The *Abrahamic covenant* remains ever inviolate, as declaring the fundamental condition of God's blessing on Abraham's true seed. Cannot possibly have been changed, through addition or subtraction, by the Mosaic law given long after.

4. 21–24. *The Law's true place and use.* A discipline in order to the great purpose of grace. It prepared for reception of that grace in the gospel. Now that that purpose is achieved, the law's place and use are antiquated. All Abraham's seed are openly manifested, as full grown, on the same footing of sonship by grace. Hence the great innovation, true "liberty, equality, and fraternity."

5. iv. 1–7. *Contrasted conditions* of a son and heir of God under the two dispensations. The same son and heir. The condition, then of pupilage, now of maturity and full possession. This condition, in legal state, procured by Christ, is accompanied or followed by a corresponding condition of heart, bestowed and secured by the Spirit.

6. 8–11. *The Galatians then and now.* Then, idol-worshipping slaves in ignorance; now, though having knowledge, yet like to relapse into bondage through perversity.

7. 12–20. *Why not here be as Paul?* Appeal to old times remembered; their enthusiastic affection towards him. Is he now their foe because he speaks truth which wounds them? Are they not the true foes who speak flatteries which kill? If Paul wound his little children, he wounds himself more deeply, labouring in anguish for their life.

8. 21–31. *Allegory.* See what the law will bring you to if you will have it as your covenant. Ishmael and Isaac; slave son of the slave, and free son of the free. Meaning Sinai and the New Jerusalem, law and gospel,

having respectively spiritual thralls and spiritual freemen as their votaries. Still, even in the community of freemen, there is an element of slavish legalism, which will not leave gospel freedom in full undisturbed possession, and therefore must itself be expelled.

III. THE APPLICATION, v., vi.

1. v. 1. *The fundamental duty* springing from the truth thus vindicated—Be free.

2. 2–6. *Reason* for this: To admit in practice the principle of legalism in any shape is to abandon Christ, to lapse from true spiritual Christianity.

3. 7–12. *Inference* from this: Search into the causes of the present departure from God, especially false teaching in its insidious beginnings; and know the false teacher as one who has to answer for his crime, not least if he insinuate that his teaching has in any way been anticipated or imitated by mine.

4. 13–15. *Caution;* liberty, not licence. Not indulgence of selfish, carnal desires, but practice of self-denying, self-sacrificing love to one another—a thing in its fruit, as well as nature, very different from a practice I have heard of.

5. 16–26. *Expansion* of this caution: not the flesh but the spirit, as impelling principle of Christian life of faith. Their reciprocal antagonism in nature and contrast in result. Works of the flesh; fruit of the Spirit. *The flesh crucified on the cross.* If we live in the Spirit, let us move correspondingly, and not in vainglory, provoking and envying.

6. vi. 1–5. *A case* for application of the above rule: A brother caught in a fault. What is (it to walk in) the Spirit here? *e.g. as seen on Christ's cross*, and as thus mortifying selfish vanity.

7. 6–10. *Another case:* the public teacher needing liberal support. Danger of self-delusion here, through insidious operation of the flesh, or of not persevering in well-doing. Let us have in full operation, relatively to liberality and other graces, the Spirit as a principle of general philanthropy and special affection to those who are Christ's.

8. 11–17. *Paul practises* what he preaches here. His kindly attention to their feelings even in the matter of handwriting. The Judaisers, beginning with self-confidence, go on in self-love to self-glorification, at the expense of their followers, and in a manner characteristically carnal or worldly. Paul, *beginning with Christ's cross*, as sole ground of faith, goes on in unworldliness of self-denying love, in order to end with glory to crucified Christ. Witness the scars with which the world, seeking only to slay him, has really branded him as Christ's true servant, and therefore a visibly sacred thing.

CLOSED WITH BENEDICTION (18).

APPENDIX TO ARTICLE (IV.) ON "CONTENTS."

I. The Word "Justify" (and "Righteousness").

1. It is a misfortune for us that our noble English version does not show the fact, that the appropriate Scripture word for "justify" (both in Greek—*dikaioein*, and in Hebrew—*hitzdik*) is literally "make righteous;" that in Scripture the words for "justification" and "righteousness" are formed from the same root. This misfortune seems irreparable: the relative use and wont, into which our language has settled down, seems to make inadmissible the word, "justice," which the Douay version has for "righteousness." But the present note may enable the English reader to understand that any information regarding the import of the Scriptural "justification" is at the same time effectively information regarding the Scriptural "righteousness," when that righteousness is spoken of in connection with justification.

This advantage the Gaelic reader obtains from the relative use of words in his Bible. The relative words in the Gaelic Bible are formed from the root *fìor* (*verum*), "true." The special use thus made of *fìor*, in relation to justification and righteousness, is illustrated by the description of "a true man," as one in right normal relation to the community or the law; and by the idiom "making an honest woman of her," as placing her in that right normal relation. And the use, as I have said, is uniform in the present relation; "righteousness" being represented by *fìreantachd*, and "justify" by *fìreanaich*, and (righteous or) justified man by *fìrean*.

2. Etymologically, "justify" means simply to "make just." But theologically to "make just" may mean two things. It may mean to make just forensically or judicially, *declaring* that the person is just, or placing him on the footing of a man who is right with the law, in respect of standing or privilege. Or it may mean to make just physically, *infusing* into him the moral quality of justness or character of goodness. At the present stage we shall distinguish these two justifications as respectively *declaratory* and *infusive*.

Augustine appears to have used the word justification so as to

cover the two things, declaration and infusion. And some friends of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith (*e.g.* Forbes of Corse, in his work on reconciliation of Paul with James) are not unwilling that in theological discussion the word should be used in this wide and general sense. But our present question is, In what sense is it used in the Bible generally, and in our Epistle specially? And our answer is, in the sense of declaration, not in the sense of infusion.

3. In classic Greek the word *dikaioein* has the meaning, "to condemn." So, too, had the word "justify" in old Scottish, classical and popular: John Owen (*On Justification*) found the word with this sense in a treaty of the Scottish Parliament with English Edward VI.; and the fate of certain Galatians near the Highland border was at one time familiarly described as their being "justified," say "on the kindly gallows of Crieff." This use, it will be observed, really makes for our contention for judicial declaration as against physical infusion. And classic usage must, as a guide to Scripture use, be taken with great caution. For the new ideas of Christian revelation have infused a new meaning into old words to such an extent that the meaning of Bible words, especially when descriptive of things distinctively Christian, can be confidently ascertained only from the Bible itself.

4. The Old Testament Scripture, especially in the Greek Septuagint translation, is that upon which the theological terminology of the New Testament has been formed. "Turning souls into righteousness," Dan. xii. 13—where the Hebrew word is that for "justify"—*may* mean, not infusion of good character, but conversion by means of instruction or example, thus turning souls to the righteousness of God. (So Gesenius, Lexicon, on *Hitzdik.*) "By His knowledge shall My righteous servant justify many" (Isa. liii. 11) is expounded by Tregelles (Ges. Lex.) as meaning justification in the forensic sense. But quite decisive in this relation is the Old Testament use of the word where "justify" is contrasted with "condemn,"—*e.g.* "I will not justify the wicked," Ex. xxiii. 7.

5. The main source of information is the New Testament Scripture itself. And regarding New Testament use we submit the following propositions:—1. There is no one case in which the word "justify" clearly means infuse goodness of character. Louis Le Blanc, a very able man, in a work (*Theses Theologicæ*) in which he labours to sophisticate the doctrine of Protestant evangelism, tries hard to find cases in which infusion is clearly meant. He can find only four cases. And in every one of the four it has been shown that

the meaning is not clearly infusion. 2. There are cases in which the word, though not referring to the justification now in view of Paul, manifestly means declaration, not infusion. We here pass with a mere allusion the use of the word in James's contention for justification by works, where "infusion" would plainly make nonsense, and "declaration" is the only sense possible. We would have the reader dwell only on such cases as, "Wisdom is justified of her children," and, "He, willing to justify himself, said, But who is my neighbour?" In these cases manifestly nothing can be meant but declaration, recognition, or demonstration. 3. In all the cases unquestionably relevant, that is, in which the thing referred to by the word is manifestly a sinner's justification before God, the process or act it describes is plainly declaratory, judicial, or forensic. In proof of this, see the following note (II.).

II. Pauline Justification.

The Pauline justification, if it do not include infusion of good character, can, as declaratory, refer only to these two things, pardon and acceptance. The word is sometimes found describing only pardon, without express reference to what is further meant by acceptance: *e.g.* "justified from all things, from which," etc. (Acts xiii. 39). In such cases the action is manifestly judicial, not physical. It is specially pardon, though not excluding acceptance, that, so to speak, we are made to see in the Pauline Epistle to the Hebrews (Pauline certainly, whether written by Paul or not) in its symbolical representation of man's way of peace with God through priestly offering of bloody sacrifice for sin. But "justification," if it be in its nature forensic or judicial, might appear from the very force of the word to mean something positive beyond the negative acquittal involved in pardon, even when only the negative, "remission of sins," is specified expressly. And this further positive, acceptance into favour, or judicial recognition as entitled to life, with all that life implies, is fully brought into view in the Epistles unquestionably written by Paul, especially those addressed to the Corinthians, to the Romans, and to the Galatians.

In the Epistle to the Romans the fundamental declaration (iii. 24–26) can be understood only on the supposition that the "justification" there is of the same nature with the "remission of sins that are past," and thus is characteristically a "declaration of God's righteousness," so as to be distinctively judicial, not physical. Then in the typical

cases of Abraham and David (for Abraham's case see further on in this note), iv. 1–8, we find at heart the strictly judicial act or process of *imputation*;—in David's case "non-imputation" of sin, manifestly the judicial act of condoning sin, or cancelling the guilt of it. The parallel of Christ to Adam in v. 12–18 is really unintelligible except on the supposition that our "justification" through Christ is of the same nature with our "condemnation" through Adam, that is, judicial not physical. So in the cry of victory (viii. 33, 34), "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" etc.; the "justification," while to an opposite effect from the inculpation and condemnation, is of the same (judicial) nature with theirs. And all this is what is demanded by the apostle's introductory description (i.-iii.) of man's condition by nature. There he describes man, not only generally as lost, needing salvation from God's mercy, but also and especially as guilty, under God's declared wrath, needing judicial pardon and acceptance.

The Epistles to the Corinthians, while not elaborate in theological discussion, are singularly powerful in theological dogmatizing to the present purpose. The First of them sets forth the grand object of faith (i. 22–24, ii. 1, xi. 23–27) as, not vaguely God in Christ, but precisely Christ crucified, shedding His blood for the remission of sins. The Second shows in what respect Christ is thus the object of faith. In iii. 7–9 we see in Him "righteousness" as opposed to "condemnation" by the law. In v. 18–21 we have a cluster of expressions, all referring to man's way of peace with God, which all demand that the strictly judicial process (of pardon and acceptance) should be recognised as the constitutive essence of justification. Observe in especial what is there said of the counter-imputations,—of our sin to Christ and His righteousness to us,—imputations which must be the same in their nature though opposite in their effects; and consider whether in the case of the Sinless One it is conceivable that the process, "making Him to be sin for us," should be a physical process,—infusion of character!

The Epistle to the Galatians, in relation to the present question, is most suitably considered as a whole, or in such an outline of contents as we have given in the preceding pages. What here and now falls to be said about "justification" will be corroborated in later notes in this appendix on "righteousness" and on "faith." At the present point we shall dwell only on the one expression about Abraham (iii. 6), "It was accounted (imputed, reckoned) to him for righteousness." We need not now inquire *what* was imputed,—

whether, for instance, it was his faith, or whether it was his work, or whether it was God's righteousness received by faith. At present we concentrate attention on the "accounting" or imputation. This is formally set forth by the apostle as a typical sample of what takes place in the justification he is reasoning about. But this is not and cannot be physical infusion; it is and can be only judicial declaration. The same inference is deducible from Paul's reasonings about the contrasted conditions of a son during and after his legal minority, iii. 24–iv. 7; from his allegory of Ishmael and Isaac, Sinai and New Jerusalem; as well as from all he says about the process of redemption through Christ, brought to a point in the startling statement, that the Blessed One was "made a curse for us," and so "has redeemed us from the curse of the law." In all these cases the process is not physical, effecting a change of personal character or disposition, but only judicial or forensic, effecting a change of legal position or standing before God.

III. Paul and James.

In James ii. 14–26 we find set forth a doctrine of justification which in words contradicts the Pauline doctrine of justification. Infidels have regarded this as implying that there is a real contradiction. Others have regarded it as meaning that Paul does not really teach the evangelical doctrine of pardon and acceptance on the ground of God's righteousness to the exclusion of human works. Evangelical Christians in general have understood it as meaning that Paul and James, while both speak of a thing which is rightly described as justification, speak respectively of two distinct species under that genus.

That the specific things of which they respectively speak are different appears from their own words. Thus the "faith" is not the same; for in James it is "without works," while in Paul it "worketh by love." And the justification is not the same; for in James—appealing to the case of Abraham—it is by works and not by faith, while in Paul—appealing to the same case of Abraham—it is by faith and not by works. And we know that in fact there are two distinct things each entitled to the name of justification as a declaratory act of God. The one is that by which a sinner receives pardon and acceptance; the other is that by which a man is declared to be a true child of God,—as, for instance, on the judgment-day.

The two justifications, thus distinct specifically, are generically

one, as being declaratory, not infusive. So far we claim the use of language in James as evidence in support of our view of the general meaning of "justify" in Scripture. And though we should be unable further to "reconcile" James with Paul, our inability to do this would not affect our right and obligation to learn from appropriate Scripture sources what is the precise meaning of Paul.

IV. The "Righteousness" in this Epistle.

That the Pauline justification is not on the ground of works, is manifest from his whole controversy with the Judaisers. For the state of the question between them and him is precisely, Whether justification is, as they affirm, or, as he affirms, is not on the ground of human works? But both they and he assume that it is forensic or judicial, by proceeding on the view that it must be on the ground of some righteousness. The question between them and him thus comes to be, What is the righteousness which is the ground of man's acceptance with God? They say that—partly at least—it is constituted by meritorious works of man. He says that—wholly and solely—it is of God, achieved through Christ, received by faith.

Some, admitting in words that it is a righteousness of God, have made it to be the holiness inseparable from divine nature, infused into man, or being in him by his nature, so that justification is simply formal recognition of that holiness of nature. This view is excluded by the fact that man, in the very act of receiving the justifying righteousness by faith, is in himself confessedly guilty and unclean; and also by the whole Scripture testimony, especially the Pauline testimony, regarding the way and manner in which the righteousness has been achieved by Christ, namely, through His vicarious obedience unto death,—His "passive obedience" for the expiation of our guilt, and His "active obedience" for the purchase to us of sonship and inheritance.

V. "Faith" in this Epistle.

The word "faith" in Scripture, as in ordinary language, is employed in a variety of senses, which of course must imply some one sense pervading all varieties in common. Its special sense in relation to justification is not formally defined in this Epistle. But the Epistle gives us means of forming a clear and distinct idea. Let us, for instance, take the great sentence in iii. 11, "The just shall live

by faith." Occurring first in Hab. ii. 4, it is quoted in the three Epistles which constitute the backbone of New Testament theology, —in Galatians as referred to, in Rom. i. 17, and in Heb. x. 38. It always means reliance upon God the Saviour, but with noteworthy varieties in shades of that meaning. It starts from the principle that all rational life is rooted in faith, including, so far as the nature of the case permits, consent as well as assent. But it applies that abstract principle of our constitution to religion, the highest form of rational life, with special emphasis on reliance, trust in God the Redeemer, as the divinely ordained way of living for the just. In Habakkuk, this doctrine is laid down in completest latitude of application, to all true life of religion, especially the religious life of nations or citizens. In the New Testament it becomes pointed especially to the *new* life, procured by redemption, or to salvation. In Romans the reference is to salvation generally, including sanctification as well as justification. In Galatians the reference is only to justification. In Hebrews the reference is specially, if not exclusively, to sanctification, or the perseverance of saints. In all the cases alike the life-giving office assigned to faith is reliance on God the Redeemer alone. And in Galatians what is said in effect is, faith discharges the same office in relation to justification which it is elsewhere described as discharging in relation generally to religious life; or specially, to salvation; or more specially, to sanctification,—the office, that is, of reliance on God the Redeemer, or (as Dr. Chalmers once said beside a death-bed) "lippening to Christ" alone (*sola solo*).

The question is not, What are the conceivable meanings of faith, or, what are its actual meanings elsewhere, but, what is its actual meaning here in this Epistle? And the answer is very clear from the tenor of the argumentation and expostulations, especially from the uniform sharp contrast of faith to works in relation to justification. To say that faith implies knowledge, intellectual assent, and (no doubt) a certain feeling corresponding to the nature of the object known or truth assented to, is not to declare the specialty of the office here assigned to faith. Or, again, to say that true faith is invariably followed by good works, the fruits of its sanctifying influence on character, or even that "faith" in a vague sense may be regarded as the bud which sums up in itself all other graces, whose unfolding manifestations are its blossoms and fruits,— this, too, is at best to speak wide of the question, What in this Epistle is faith described as doing in relation to justification? For in this Epistle, though faith is said to work by love, yet we are not said to

be justified by works as we are by faith, but we are uniformly said *not* to be justified by works as we are by faith; and we are nowhere said to be justified by any other grace, while we are everywhere said to be justified by faith. In short, this Epistle fully establishes the *sola* of the Reformation: "faith alone justifies, though the faith which justifies does not remain alone." Its distinctive office, which constitutes its solitariness among the graces, is *reliance* upon God, or "receiving and resting on" Christ alone, for pardon and acceptance.

VI. Case of Believers under the Old Testament.

A secondary question regarding faith is fairly raised by the discussion, iii. 23–iv. 7, of the contrast of the two dispensations in their respective bearings on the condition of God's people. There it is assumed without qualification (vers. 23 and 24) that in the old dispensation "faith had not come," and that it "is come" only in our new dispensation. The Scripture statements are often unqualified. It is the manner of Scripture, of Christ (*e.g.* Luke xiv. 26), to make the point that falls to be made and pressed at the time, leaving any needful qualifications to be found in complementary statements, or in a reasonable consideration of the point that is made as illustrated by the occasion of making it. And any needful qualifications of Paul's startling assumption here can easily be found elsewhere in his own writings, in this Epistle, and even in the passage in which the startling assumption is made by him.

He is reasoning about the contrasted offices of law and gospel-promise. The old dispensation is regarded by him only under its *characteristic* aspect, as a ministration of law condemning to death; and the new dispensation, only under its *characteristic* aspect (of contrast to the old), as a ministration of promise and life in the gospel. He does not forget that the old dispensation, though it was a ministration of law on its face, had a ministration of grace in its heart; that thus far Moses was a veiled Christ, and Christ is Moses unveiled (2 Cor. iii. 13–18). Thus he speaks of Israel under the law as having been children and heirs of God, though in a state of minority, and consequently under "a schoolmaster," under "tutors and governors," and thus far in a condition of subjection, from which they have been redeemed in the completed time of their majority through the coming of the First-born to free them by His subjection and its fruits. When, therefore, Paul speaks about faith

as not having come in the old dispensation in contradistinction to the new in which it is come, he must be understood as meaning only that the new is *characteristically* the dispensation of faith, that in which has appeared clearly and fully the sinner's way of receiving justification, even as it is that in which has appeared clearly and fully the way and work of God in procuring and bestowing justification. Consistently with what He says here, God's children (as he elsewhere variously says and shows) under the old dispensation were really justified in the same way as under the new, the same way as Abraham before the law of Moses was given. Everything is in the child, infolded, that is, unfolded, in the mature man. But it is in the fully developed man that we clearly see the normal nature of manhood. It is in the new dispensation, characteristically of faith, that we clearly see the normal nature and office of faith; while in the old dispensation, as presenting a characteristic office of law, we find a convenient illustration of contrast. This office of the law, as a ministration of condemnation, is worth remembering here on this other account, that it shows to men who are tempted to Judaise what they must come to if they will have a religion of law as the way to justification,—perverting the law to a purpose for which, as given through Moses, it never was intended (iii. 21). But in the passage now under consideration (iii. 23, etc.) Paul employs the old dispensation only as an illustration of contrast to his doctrine of faith.

VII. Case of Infants, etc.

The view thus obtained suggests a note about the relation of Paul's argument to the cases in which the faith he contends for is naturally impossible,—cases of infants, of idiots, and of heathens never reached with the gospel offer of salvation. The Westminster Confession, in its chapter (x.) on the gospel call, "Of effectual calling," speaks thus:—Sec. 3. "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are uncapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word." This comes after the leading statement (sec. 1) without qualification, that *all* who are to be saved God calls by the word, quickens, enlightens, moves, causes to believe on Christ. But manifestly the confessors in that leading statement are speaking only of the normal case, declaring how God chooses to proceed in the case of men who

are *not* "uncapable of being outwardly called." And their qualifying statement (sec. 3) shows that in their judgment God, while intimating that as His method of saving men in the normal case, has reserved to Himself the power of saving otherwise than by that method in cases which are not normal. Now such a qualification is suggested by Paul's reasoning about justification in this Epistle. Speaking to the normal case of men in the full light of the new dispensation, he declares without qualification that the way of faith is the only way of life for man, that to be off this way is to be on the way of death. And yet, by his manner of speaking of the condition of God's people under the old dispensation as children, who in a sense were in bondage, he allows it to appear that justification could reach *them* in their abnormal condition, without, on their part, that clearness and explicitness of faith which is rigorously indispensable in the normal condition. Then, by speaking thus of children comparatively immature (literally, "infants"), he suggests the thought of children completely infant, blind, and unconscious; and so, thereupon, the thought of other classes of human beings in a similarly helpless condition relatively to the "ministry of the word." And when we have thus been led to reflect on their case, we perceive that Paul's doctrine, regarding the only way of obtaining life for adults in clear and full light, does not exclude the possibility of God's proceeding, if He will, on a different way to the salvation of human beings whose cases are abnormal.

VIII. The "Flesh" in this Epistle.

In a note on "flesh" in ii. 16 of the Epistle, I give various senses in which the term is used in Scripture. The strain of the apostle's argument enables us to see "the flesh" in a special relation to justification. Thus, first, towards the end of the Epistle we find that the theology of "the circumcision" is associated with the flesh, even in its lowest sense, as springing from and tending towards shallow sensuousness in general. But it is most manifestly associated with the flesh in the higher sense of vanity or silly self-conceit. On the one hand, it is a foolish thing to rely for justification on any such thing as "flesh," even in the innocent sense of merely human power or goodness. On the other hand, the disposition to seek justification in that way is not only foolish but deeply criminal. The vanity or pride of self-righteousness is essentially ungodly. Some theologians have raised the question, whether vanity or pride (*superbia*, *hubris*,

overweeningness) was not the essence of man's first sin. A great theologian once said that there is no other thing that makes such a scoundrel of a man as vanity. Some have even ventured to maintain that all sin consists in selfishness or *egoism*. And Paul, in the act of battling for his doctrine of justification, is assailing this proud flesh in its very citadel of pride ; demanding that in the heart of our religious life we should own ourselves as helplessly dependent on God's mercy, that this confession should ever lie at the foundation of our dealings with God. There is thus a deep significance in "*obeying* the gospel," "*submitting* to the righteousness of God." And thus there may have been a specialty of relative purpose in the selection, for scriptural dealing with reference to justification, of a Gentile race characteristically vain.

IX. The "Law" in this Epistle.

Though this subject is co-ordinate with those already dealt with in the appendix, it does not call for elaborate theological discussion. It will be observed that "works of the law" are specifically distinct from "works of the flesh." The law is uniformly spoken of respectfully, as good in its own place, and as serving an important purpose in relation to the gospel. But some, on account of what is said or implied about abrogation or supersession, have supposed that by "law" in this Epistle is meant only the *ceremonial* of Judaism. In the notes under the relative texts, I have proceeded on the view that the ceremonial is regarded by Paul only as a sample of law in general, his main contention being that *no such thing* as law can have the place and use assigned by Judaisers to circumcision in relation to pardon and acceptance. His whole argument would have been frustrated if he had excluded from view the *moral* part of the law as given by Moses. That moral part was recognised even by unconverted Jews as not only a part of "the law," but itself "the law" by eminence. And that moral part is at least the main thing meant by "all the law" in v. 14. Abrogation of "the law," in the sense here intended by Paul, is fully consistent with the indefectible authority of a part of it, even the most important part ; for it is abrogated only as a covenant of works, or as pertaining to the old dispensation, and thus may have abiding authority, even in the new dispensation, as a rule of life.

PAUL TO THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

CHAPTER I.

1 PAUL, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by
Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from
2 the dead;) And all the brethren which are with me, unto the

(1.) The Salutation (i. 1–5).

Here, in addition to what is common to this salutation with others, we mark specialties which adumbrate the Epistle as a whole:—1. Paul's customary expression of *thanks or praise*, in connection with the churches addressed, is here conspicuous by absence. 2. He here (ver. 1) very strongly asserts his independent apostolic *office* as derived straight from God. 3. (vers. 3–5) The customary reference to God the Saviour is pointed so as to bear against the Galatian apostasy from *faith*.

1. *Paul . . . dead. Apostle* here is not, vaguely, **emissary** (Acts xiv. 14). The word is manifestly employed in the high sense, appropriated to the Twelve who stood nearest to Christ. What follows makes Paul's apostleship to be **immediately from God** in Christ. *Of men:* literally, **from men** (**human beings**), —as if by delegation from a church. *By man:* **through man** (**human being**), —as if by ordination of an individual "laying on" his hand as representative of the church. *By Jesus Christ . . . Father.* Here Christ, at least as superhuman, is put on a level with God the Father: the same *by* (or **through**) applies to both. But the point is, that Paul's office has come to him **from** God in Christ. *Who . . . dead.* Christ's resurrection shows that He is Son of God (Rom. i. 4) and Head of ordinances, including apostleship (Eph. iv. 7–12). Thus the risen Christ has right to make Paul an apostle if He will. But is there not here a further point? It is plain that in Galatia it has been whispered that Paul can be no true apostle, because he has not known Christ in the flesh. May it not be meant here to suggest,—Paul stands really higher than the others thus far, that their appointment came from Christ humbled, while Paul's has come from Christ exalted and glorified?

2. *All . . . me.* He does not here, as elsewhere, name individual associates in his labours. Does he, therefore, mean to bring in, as fellow-witnesses with him, against the Galatian apostasy, **the whole church** of the place from which he writes? Perhaps not: *all the brethren which are with me* may mean only **all my colleagues, my official associates**—whose names *you* may not care to hear.

3 churches of Galatia: Grace *be* to you and peace from God
4 the Father, and *from* our Lord Jesus Christ, Who gave him-
self for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present
evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:
5 To whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.

The churches of Galatia. This, therefore, is a *circular* letter for communities here and there throughout the Galatian land. (See Introd. pp. 13–21.) The evil which he seeks to counteract and expel is manifestly widespread.

3. *Grace . . . Christ.* Here, again, Christ is put on a level with the Father, and that now in respect of what is manifestly divine—the gift or origination of *grace and peace:* as in ver. 1 there is only one *by* for the two persons, so here there is only one *from*. *Grace* is the manifestation of divine favour *to* sinful men. *Peace* is the result *in* them of that grace apprehended and appropriated—seen and taken home—*by* them.

4, 5. *Who gave . . . Amen!* "*This* is the character in which Christ presents Himself to His Christians:—look at *this*, and die to your vain ceremonialism." *Amen* (says Paul): **Truth:** so be it! God grant that we and all, even those "foolish Galatians," may see it, own it, allow it to be; that not only my office, but our common salvation, all flows from sovereignty of free redeeming love of God in Christ!

For our sins . . . evil world. For our sins: **on account of our sins**. (See note on "for me" in ii. 20.) Our sins are the occasion of His self-sacrifice in death (Matt. xxvi. 28). *The present evil world: World*—aeon—**age**, or **state of things**, characterised as *evil*. *Deliverance:* **rescue**, may include relief from the plague of self-righteous Judaism. *Present:* some would prefer **approaching**. It may here have a mixed meaning like "instant," when referring to an **approaching** part of a *present* month: cp. "The hour cometh, and now is."

According . . . Father: **Of God even our Father** (?). The clause makes their salvation—like Paul's office—to be completely of God. The Father's primacy in this relation was declared by the Son Himself (*e.g.* John vi. 37–40).

5. *To whom . . . and ever:* **To whom the glory to the ages of ages (aeons)**. Such a *gloria* frequently breaks from Paul's heart at this view of salvation all from God, or of God as the only Saviour. *Glory* here has the article in Greek, and ought to retain it. *Be* (glory) is weak; for the verb implied is *is* **(whose is the glory)**, as the article shows. Cp. the *aeons* here with the *aeon* in ver. 4; and the *glory* here with the *glory* in v. 26 and vi. 12.

What were the proper evidences of apostleship in the highest sense?
What thing is common to the respective offices of Barnabas, of Peter, and of Christ?
Does Paul's saying that he is an apostle serve to show that he is? In what cases are we entitled to take the word of the witness for the character of the witness?

(2.) The Galatian Position (6–10).

The people apostatizing from God; the misleading teachers accursed of God; and Paul standing true to his colours.

6 I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called
7 you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is
not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would
8 pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel
from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that
9 which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As

6. *I marvel . . . removed.* About the *so soon*, see Introd. p. 25. *I marvel that:* **strange that!** From ver. 9 it may appear that their apostasy has been to him a foreseen possibility; and the feeling expressed here may be that their conduct is not simply surprising but revolting, because (in their case) unnatural or monstrous. *Are removed:* **are removing, going over, deserting.**

Him that called you: *i.e.* God (1 Cor. i. 9, 26–30, and note on "caller" in Gal. v. 8). *Into the grace of Christ*: lit. **in.** When God calls the flowers into manifested life, it is *in* the genial radiance of the sun that He calls them.

Another gospel: lit. **a different** (way of peace with God). See next note.

7. *Not another.* Here the Greek is translated literally. The word here is not the same as in ver. 6. The meaning of the two clauses is,—"a different sort of thing called gospel, which really is not a new gospel, nor indeed a real gospel at all."

But there be some . . . Christ. The *but* here is in the Greek the same as *save* in ver. 19. The turn of expression has no corresponding English idiom. The meaning is = **but in fact:** as if he had said, "What has taken place is not a real gospel preaching: what really has taken place is a disturbance," etc.

Some that trouble you: **certain persons (personages ?) who characteristically disturb you.**

And would pervert: lit. **mean to turn round** (into a different thing).

8. *But though we . . . heaven:* **but if even we,** *i.e.* Paul with all his following. The allusion to *angel* may be occasioned by what is stated in iv. 14. In ver. 9 the expression, *if any one*, serves to complete the representation,—"if any creature, on earth or in heaven."

Preach any other gospel to you . . . unto you: lit. **gospel-preach to you beyond (or besides) what we gospel-preached to you.** The expression in ver. 9 is lit. **if any one gospel-preaches you beyond or besides what ye received;** where the indicative apparently points to a false teacher then at work. The work consists, not in preaching infidelity, but in preaching as the gospel what is not the gospel. Whether the guilt of this attaches to *every* addition to the gospel, is not determined by this text. It certainly attaches to every teaching that is effectively evasion and consequently supersession:—*e.g.*, in the case before Paul's mind, teaching legalism under the name of evangelism.

Let him be accursed. This expresses not a mere wish, but a formal and solemn judgment, as if on behalf of God. *Be accursed* is lit. **be a curse.** The word for *curse* is *anathĕma.* A different form of the same word, *anathēma*, occurs in classic Greek. Primarily it meant *devoted* to any festive purpose: thus in Hom. *Odyss.* i. 152, and xxi. 430, music and dancing are "*anathēmas* of the feast." Then it meant appropriately, devoted *to God*, *e.g.* by being set up in His temple: a use of *anathēma* which occurs in Luke xxi. 5, "gifts;" while the same meaning attaches to anathĕma in (Sept.) Lev. xxvii. 28, "devoted thing." But an animal set apart for sacrifice is doomed to death;

we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be
10 accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.
11 But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was
12 preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it

whence the special meaning of *anathĕma* as "a curse," a thing devoted *to destruction:* thus in Deut. vii. 26, "a cursed thing." *This* is the only meaning of *anathĕma* in the New Testament. (The other places are Acts xxiii. 14; Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, and xvi. 22.)

9. *As we said before . . . again:* **As we before have said, now too I again declare.** The previous declaration was probably on occasion of his second visit to Galatia (Acts xviii. 23), when the declaration, in view of temptations by false teachers, may have been one of his methods of "strengthening the brethren." But the main point here, even of the repetition, is that the true gospel, once delivered from God, is thenceforward *definitive*, as a star once created shines on "for ever:" so that to preach "*another* gospel," which really cannot be "another *gospel*," is to lay one's self under God's curse.

10. *For now . . . God?* **For now is it men that I persuade, or God?** The word for *now* here, and in ver. 9, is emphatic, as if meaning, "at *this* point, at this *critical* moment"—am I to fall back from my then position? *Persuade* here plainly means, *speak with a view to please;* pleasing is one main means of persuading.

(*For*) *if I yet pleased men . . . Christ:* **(For) if I still went on man-pleasing, Christ's servant were I not.** (The "for" is of doubtful textual authority.) The word here for *pleasing* usually implies the sort of *deference* that one owes to a superior—the spirit of service. Paul could defer to, and even be the servant of, his inferiors, when that was compatible with true obedience to Christ (2 Cor. iv. 5). So he no doubt once dealt with the Galatians, as seems to be intimated by the imperfect tense, "went on pleasing." But mark the *still*, as compared with the *now* in vers. 8 and 9: that can be **no longer**, when men can be pleased only through disloyalty to the King. *Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.*

Why should the preacher of "another gospel" be accursed of God?
Is a church entitled to curse heretics on God's behalf?

(3.) Paul's Right and Duty to speak thus (11–24).

His gospel direct from God; in no way from the earlier apostles, whether indirectly or directly. "I can no other: God help me."

11. *But . . . brethren* explains in a kindly way that he *must* proceed as he has. *Not after man:* **not according to man.** The meaning is, that the gospel he preached he cannot depart from to please them, because it is not a matter of giving and taking between men, at his pleasure or theirs.

12. *For I . . . Christ.* The *I* is emphatic. *Of man* is **from man.** The **from man** is probably also to be understood after *taught it.* And both the

of man, neither was I taught *it*, but by the revelation of Jesus
13 Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past
in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted
14 the church of God, and wasted it: And profited in the Jews'
religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being
more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.

teaching and the receiving are here said to have been (only) *by the revelation of Jesus Christ*. The structure of the sentence, broken up in our version, is this: **For as for me, it was not from man that I obtained either the original gift of the same** (gospel), **or the more detailed explanation of it, but** (both?) **through the revelation of Jesus Christ.** But see next note:

Received . . . taught. In the above note I have given what I regard as the most feasible construction. But an alternative worth considering is this: that the *taught it* is not connected with the *received it* by the *of man*, but stands as an independent statement,—as in our version. Then the concluding clause will be more loosely connected with the first and second: "Of *my* knowledge of that gospel the history is this. I did not receive it from man. And I was not taught it. (I have it) through revelation of Jesus Christ."

By the revelation . . . Christ. By is **through.** As it is *not from man* that he has it, so it is *from God*. And from God it comes *through* revelation of Christ. The *revelation* here might mean, the process of revealing Christ. Most probably what it does mean is, Christ's process of revealing the gospel. Again, His process of revealing might include the employment of men as His instruments, as, *e.g.*, when He "reveals to us, by His word and Spirit, the will of God." But here Paul manifestly means that it should be regarded as exclusive of human instrumentality. The very point of his statement here is, that his knowledge of the gospel has not come to him from man or through man, but *direct from God in Christ*. So that *revelation* here is *immediate* communication. But why say *the* revelation?

13, 14. *For ye have heard . . . my fathers. For*="in proof of what I have just said." *Ye have heard:* perhaps better, ye **heard,**—look back, recall to mind how the matter stood at first. The matter stood thus, as was known to you by report:—I was not in a position to receive the gospel from its apostles and evangelists. My position was that of an unconverted Jew, a murderous persecutor of God's true church, fanatically contending for the old religion, in the knowledge and practice of which I excelled.

13. *My conversation . . .*: **my manner of life.** Then all the following verbs, *persecuted, wasted, profited*, are in the imperfect tense, describing a continued course of conduct: **I went on persecuting, wasting, profiting.**

The Jews' religion: lit. **Judaism.** Here contrasted with *the church of God.* Paul's *profiting*—lit. **progressing**—*in it*, refers to the practice of it—*my conversation*—as well as to the knowledge and burning belief of it.

Wasted: **devastated,** as an enemy "wastes" a province with fire and sword.

14. *Mine equals:* in respect of age. His *young* fellow-zealots (Acts vii. 58).

Traditions of my fathers. This might mean simply the *inherited* system, without imputing untruth or impurity to the system; for a tradition, oral or written, through men may be from God (2 Thess. ii. 15, and iii. 6). But the actual system, represented by the Pharisees' religion, had come to obscure

15 But when it pleased God, who separated me from my
16 mother's womb, and called *me* by his grace, To reveal his
Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen;

and corrupt the original revelation of God (Matt. xv. 3, 6). Paul, as a thoroughgoing Pharisee himself (Acts xxvi. 5), no doubt went to the utmost extreme of traditionalist antagonism to the new religion.

Of my fathers has been supposed to mean, **of Paul's own family** (Acts xxiii. 6). But this is not required by the passage, but rather excluded by the circumstance that he is now appealing to the memory of the Galatians, who are not likely to have heard of such a detail. And the expression in itself fully admits the vaguer construction, **of Paul's predecessors in his nation,** as the same expression must be construed in 1 Pet. i. 18, and "ancestral tradition" would be with us.

15–17. *But when . . . Damascus:* probably better, **And when.** Paul, having shown that he cannot have received his gospel from men before his conversion, now proceeds to show that he cannot have received it from men at any time soon after his conversion, especially not from the leaders at Jerusalem; because for three years after he was (secluded from men, or at least?) far away from Jerusalem.

15, 16. *When it pleased God . . . heathen.* "God" is of doubtful textual authority. **It pleased (Him) who separated me,** etc., would come to the same thing; for "to reveal *His Son in me*" shows that the person is God the Father (Matt. xi. 25–27). The word for *pleased* here is (as in Matt. xi. 26) that appropriated for expression of *sovereignty* of will. And the sovereignty is made to shine through the execution of God's purpose here, in the *separation,* the *calling,* and the *revealing.*

15. *Separated . . . womb. From the womb* means strictly, **from the time of birth.** But there is no need here of strict construction. The purpose of the clause requires only that we should understand, **before I was a conscious free agent.** In other words, the separation (in decree or purpose about to be executed) was *sovereign.* But see further, note on *heathen* in ver. 16.

Called me by his grace: not, as in ver. 6, *in* "*the grace of Christ.*" In the history of his conversion (Acts ix. 1–9) we see that there was, so to speak, surrounding him the grace of Christ, in the sense of bright manifestation to him of God's redeeming love in Christ (*ibid.* 3–5). But in the present text the calling, which was effectual, owed its efficacy to grace, redeeming love *sovereignly* accomplishing its purpose *in Paul.*

16. *To reveal . . . heathen. In* me, and so *through* me (see Luke xi. 36). The calling is a preparation for the man's being filled with the light of God's glory in Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4). And in Paul's case the light in him was intended to be diffused through him, as when a gas-lustre, itself filled with light, fills the room with light. At the time of his conversion (Acts ix. 15) it had been intimated that he was a "chosen vessel" of Christ for this very purpose.

Among the heathen: **the nations**—elsewhere in our version, often, **the Gentiles.** This by way of contrast to the "peculiar people." Our word *heathen* ("the *heath* folks?") has by use and wont come to have a meaning precisely corresponding to that of "the nations" in the Old and New Testaments. Paul was to preach *among* them ("before the Gentiles," Acts ix. 15). Not *to* them exclusively; for in heathen lands he conformed to the rule "to the Jews first," first going to a synagogue where there was one. But

17 immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither
went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before
me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto
18 Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem

to them distinctively, as *his* especial charge (ii. 7, 9; and Acts xv. 7). He was elected, called, and qualified to be "the apostle of the Gentiles" (Eph. iii. 7, 8). And this throws back a light upon his separation *from birth*. His birth was so arranged in providence as to constitute him the best "raw material" for the making of an apostle to the Gentiles. For, to say nothing of his great natural gifts, and his liberal and theological education, and varied opportunities of knowing men of all ranks, both Jewish and Gentile, he was the only one of the apostles born and bred outside of Palestine,—*in* a strenuously orthodox Jewish family, no doubt, but *among* the heathen.

Immediately . . . blood. For various meanings of *flesh*, see below, note on ii. 16. Here, plainly, *flesh and blood* means simply, **any human being**, so as to show that Paul's knowledge of the gospel—his whole qualification for apostleship—was solely from God. *Conferred not* does not necessarily imply that he held no conversation about the gospel with such men as Ananias, but only that he **had no** such **comparing of notes** with any one as would have resulted in his learning the gospel from man. *Immediately* means that, in some way, as soon as it pleased God to call and qualify him for office, he was abruptly withdrawn from all human means of such instruction.

17. *Neither went I up . . . I went into.* Of equal authority is the reading **went I off**, or **away**. The *I went into* is lit. **I went away into**, or **off to**.

To Jerusalem . . . into Arabia . . . unto Damascus. In all the three cases the preposition is the same, and is quite adequately rendered—**to**. This would leave **unto** for use instead of *to* in the clause, *to the apostles*. In relation to them, the preposition thus rendered **unto** is appropriate for description of a visit *to persons*. He did not go to see the apostles at Jerusalem; but he went first to Arabia, and then back to Damascus.

18. *Then after three years . . . days.* **Cephas** is here the right reading, not *Peter*. The history in Acts ix. 20–31 has little of detail in common with the biographical notes here, but nothing inconsistent with them. The *three years* here apparently refer to a period of Paul's stay in Damascus after his return from Arabia; but really they must be reckoned from the date of his conversion. The visit referred to here is that referred to in Acts ix. 26. In the Acts we find the *public occasion* of Paul's leaving Damascus, viz. persecution: here we have *the private purpose* which, on his expulsion from that city, guided his steps to Jerusalem, viz. *to see Cephas* (lit. **to inquire** him), "**to interview**" him. Here, again, we have *the fact* of a *short* stay, which alone concerns the present argument (he took no course of study at their feet); while in the history we have, what affected the whole church, the *occasion* of that shortness,—persecution again. So, once more, the history vaguely says that Barnabas "brought him to the apostles," etc.; our Epistle (ver. 19) says precisely what is *here* to the point, that of apostolic men he saw only Peter and James. The *reason* why (Acts ix.) Barnabas brought him to the apostles was, that the brethren were afraid of him, and would not believe he was a disciple, as may well have been, supposing the truth of the story in this Epistle, —one of several "undesigned coincidences," of two manifestly independent narratives, which serve to show the truth of both.

19 to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other
of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.
20 Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God,
21 I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and
22 Cilicia: And was unknown by face unto the churches of
23 Judæa which were in Christ: But they had heard only, That

19. *James the Lord's brother.* There is no scriptural reason to doubt that he was a younger son of Mary the wife of Joseph: the vaguer meaning of **cousin** is not called for by Scripture. The sentence does not make James an apostle: see note on "but" in ver. 7. It may mean only: **Other of the apostles saw I none—the only other (man of mark) I saw was James.** He is here called *the Lord's brother* to distinguish him from the Apostle James, "the brother of John," who was at *this* time alive—not yet "slain with the sword" (Acts xii. 2). In referring to later periods, when this apostle James was dead, our Epistle (ii. 9, 12) gives no such note of distinction, but says simply *James.* Such minute coincidences are very significant. As reasons why *James the Lord's brother* should have been taken along with Peter into the conference, we observe that (ii. 9–12) this James appears to have had considerable influence with Peter, and to have been peculiarly strict about terms of religious fellowship. Was it *he* that wound up the synodical discussion?

20. Thus oaths are lawful. But why *at this point* resort to the solemnity of an oath? Is there current a decidedly different account of this *private* matter, which Peter and James have not duly contradicted? If so, a judgment—not by Paul's will—for their baseness is impending on them both, in the following (ii. 12–14) recital of a *public* matter, where Paul is not in any way dependent on *their* testimony.

21. *Afterwards . . . Cilicia. Afterwards;* the word, translated *then* in ver. 18, marks definite progress in time. Syria is mentioned before Cilicia. On this account some have thought that Paul must have journeyed by land through Syria along the coast, round to his native province. There is no need of this: Syria might be mentioned first, as, with Antioch its capital, a most important province of the young Christendom. The vagueness of the expression, *to the regions* (**country sides**), shows that this is no itinerarium. The history (Acts ix. 30) says that the brethren brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus (capital of Cilicia): of which the natural construction is, that they sent him off by sea, the customary route. Tarsus was his birth-place: does he here pause in his argument, to linger for a little in the "bitter sweet" recollection of that memorable home-coming?

22. *Which were in Christ.* Does this glance at a church-standing of the synagogues, which were *not* in Christ, in the sense of having come to see that *Jesus* is the Christ? Among them may have been children of God in the condition described in iii. 23.

Of Judæa. Not, of Jerusalem. From the history (Acts ix.) we know that brethren *there* must have known him by face. But see the following note.

Was unknown by face: lit. **continued unknown by face.** This barely admits the suggestion that they may have seen his face. What it makes clear is, that they had no continued personal acquaintance with him, that he was continuously in personal unacquaintance with them.

23. *Only they had heard:* better, **they were hearing, went on hearing,—** the *continued* state of things more fully described.

he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith
24 which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me.

That he . . . destroyed. The word for *destroying* (the faith) here is in ver. 13 rendered *wasting* (the church). But *destroyed* is lit. **went on destroying**, or, **was a habitual destroyer of.** The thing which they were in the way of hearing is here in the direct oration, as if extracted from a contemporary report, in inverted commas,—They heard that "Our old persecutor is now preaching the faith which he was wont to destroy."

As to the three years in ver. 18: *if Paul did not preach then, how was he employed?*

Mention two famous cases of seclusion in the Arabia of this Epistle, one in sacred history and one in profane. Also two famous cases of seclusion in modern church history, one Protestant and one Popish.

CHAPTER II.

1 THEN fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem
2 with Barnabas, and took Titus with *me* also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or

(4.) SECOND VISIT TO JERUSALEM, ii. 1–10 (see Introd. pp. 25–27).

Paul's gospel and office alike owned as of God by the earlier apostles.

1. *Then fourteen years after. Then*, the same word, is *afterwards* in i. 21, which see. This at first sight makes *the fourteen years* to start from the end of the previous three years. But a certain variation in the original description of the one period from that of the other warrants the suggestion, that the fourteen may be reckoned from the same starting-point as the three, *i.e.* probably from Paul's conversion. And when we look close, we can perceive that the *then* does not forbid the suggestion: *three* years after (a certain date) he went to Jerusalem, and *fourteen* years after (the same date) he went *again* to Jerusalem.

Again to Jerusalem. Not necessarily, a *second* time. His second visit (see Introd. p. 25) may have been that mentioned in Acts xi.; and the one mentioned here may have been his third; for here he has no occasion to speak of all his visits, but only to speak of those which illustrate his relative independence as a teacher and apostle.

Titus, as to whom see Introd. p. 26.

2. *By revelation*—in obedience to a revelation. See Introd. p. 25.

Communicated to them: **laid before them.**

Privately . . . reputation. As to the *privacy*, see Introd. p. 26, and the following note. *Them which were of reputation* (lit. **those who appear**): **the "shining" ones, the honourably conspicuous, the recognised leaders.**

3 had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me, being
4 a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they

Lest . . . vain. Here there is such another present-past as in i. 23. "They had heard that he. . . . preacheth." *Should run* in the Greek is present, and *had run* is past; as if Paul were here giving an extract from the then written grounds on which he entered the conference: **Lest he should now be running, or his past course should be made to have been run, in vain.** The foot-race for a prize is with Paul a favourite image. *In vain:* lit. **to an empty thing,** or, **to emptiness:** as if one running for a pearl of great price were to get only an air-bubble. Such miscarriage might result from extemporaneous *public* discussion, in which there might emerge an appearance of disagreement in doctrine if men had not previously taken due pains to ascertain the fact that there really was no disagreement.

3. *But neither Titus . . . circumcised:* **But** (or **and**) **not even Titus:** there was not so much as this of concession to Judaism. *Being a Greek* (Hellene),—not a "Grecian" (Hellenist),—*i.e.* being a born Gentile: this is the reason why no constraint was laid upon him, as there might have been if it had been Timothy (Acts xvi. 1–3), a half Jew by birth, and a complete Jew in upbringing (2 Tim. i. 5).

Compelled is the word employed here, in ver. 14, and in vi. 12 (there rendered "constrain"): that is, whenever Paul has occasion to describe the *manner* in which Jewish Christians sought to get Gentile Christians to receive the rite, whether at Jerusalem, at Antioch, or in Galatia. Paul does not here plainly say that the compulsion in Titus' case was attempted by the Jerusalem church; but his way of speaking seems to show that compulsion was the well-known manner wherever the circumcision of a Gentile was sought. Compulsion is characteristic of self-righteousness and externalism in religion: witness the blind man's treatment by the Pharisees, as contrasted with the manner of the Good Shepherd, who will enter only by "the door,"—the right and lawful way (John ix. x.).

4. *And that because of false brethren:* lit. **but** (or **and**) **on account of the false brethren.** The real meaning seems to be that aimed at in our version. The attempt at compulsion had been made but repelled; and the *repulsion* was on account of the false brethren, to guard against the evils which would result through *their* machinations from concession in this case: they, who probably had in an underhand way made or instigated the attempt, would have made success a precedent, of slavish legalism, for all similar cases.

False brethren unawares brought in: **Suppositious ("changeling?") pseudo-brethren**—as if hostile soldiers, disguising themselves in the Queen's uniform, had been insinuated into her garrisons or armies. Their falsehood may have been only *in respect of* the thing in question, circumcision or uncircumcision. See note on "dissembling," ver. 13. But Paul's description seems to make falsehood characteristic of their whole proceedings and character: a thing sometimes exemplified by certain classes of fanatical religionists in later ages.

To spy out is here a military metaphor (see Gen. xlii. 9–12). Their purpose was not simply to observe, but to observe weaknesses, for the hostile purpose of assault. The description thus deepens the impression, that they

5 might bring us into bondage: To whom we gave place by
subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel
6 might continue with you. But of those who seemed to be
somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to
me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed

may have been unconverted Jews in disguise. But most probably they were only Judaising Christians, insinuating themselves into the counsels of the liberal section of the church, for the purpose of finding out some weak point for assault at the synod.

Our liberty . . . bondage. The weakest point, most open to assault, found by the spies, was the case of Titus, a born Gentile, who not only had a place in the church, but was distinctively an associate of Paul, and even a public teacher—yet uncircumcised! But in his case it was clear to Paul that Christian *liberty* was endangered, and *bondage* threatened; not only (1) as to manner, because it is oppression to use *compulsion* in religion, but also and especially (2) as to matter, because in this case *the thing demanded* was by Christ's will now not obligatory even on Jews, and the imposition of it on Gentiles would have imperilled the gospel truth (ver. 14).

5. *To whom . . . with you.* Paul (Acts xvi. 3) could conform to the Mosaic ceremonial when the conformity could be understood as only acquiescence in a venerable though now antiquated custom of his people: so far he would go in kindly deference to prejudice which, though unenlightened, was harmless. But now, to make the required concession to the false brethren would be to confer domination on their legalism, in such circumstances that the domination would intercept even from Gentile Christians the healing light which has hitherto shone upon them. *With you* (to you), in the Greek has here the force of a *dwelling with*, which, like that of the sun's light, is the result of *movement towards*. And it has a sting for the Galatians—it was not for myself but *for you* I was battling, *your* life in the gospel truth.

The truth of the gospel. It has by some been assumed that by "Paul's gospel," "the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles," is meant only the gospel in its completed outcome of liberty for the Gentiles from the antiquated ceremonial. The present text shows concern for the gospel in its essence. So does the whole Epistle. The strain of it is, not only ceremonialism affects injuriously a liberty permitted to Gentiles by the gospel in its outcome, but it endangers *the gospel truth*,—the gospel in its essence or substance, as a declaration of God's way of salvation for men.

6. *But of those . . . nothing to me.* The *but* here marks a transition from the matter disposed of in vers. 3–5, his dealing with opposition of *private* parties, such as the false brethren, to the new matter of his then manifested relation to the leaders, here described as *those who seemed to be somewhat*, an expression which—excepting the *somewhat* = considerable persons—in ver. 2 is rendered "which were of reputation" (see note). For clearness' sake, we for the moment throw out the clauses which our version has in brackets. The sentence is then seen to be an *anacolouthon:* it is not completed in the line on which it begins. The apostle begins to say, from the shining leaders I received no addition to my gospel. But a digression stops him. And when he resumes, it is on a somewhat different line, to which he comes from the digression by way of the *for:* they in conference added to me nothing.

Whatsoever . . . person: What sort of men they formerly were. This

7 *to be somewhat* in conference added nothing to me: But
contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncir-
cumcision was committed unto me, as *the gospel* of the
8 circumcision *was* unto Peter; (For he that wrought effectu-
ally in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same

rendering has suggested the view, that Paul may have been taunted with his past career as a persecutor, when the earlier apostles were in personal attendance on the Lord. The suggestion seems at best far-fetched: it is not called for. *It maketh no matter to me*, does not express contempt, nor call in question their claim to highest reputation and honours, but only says that that does not affect Paul's convictions of truth and duty—inasmuch as *God accepteth no man's person:* **God respecteth not the person of man**—emphasis of contrast between *God* and *man*. "Respect of persons," when ascribed *to men* in the New Testament, means partiality. But the absence of it in God is more than impartiality,—it is *sovereignty*. In Acts x. 34, Peter confesses this truth, in application to God's sovereignty in admitting sinners to salvation—admitting Gentiles as well as Jews. Here Paul applies the same truth to the effect that no man's standing, no matter how high, makes him the exclusive recipient and depositary of truth; but that God can, if he will, make others to be recipients and depositaries, so that what they have received from Him they must keep and diffuse, regardless of all human authority.

7–9. *But contrariwise . . . unto the circumcision.* So far from my having received any addition to my gospel from them (as authorities), they formally and solemnly owned me and covenanted with me as an apostle, on the same level with the foremost of them, and as such sent and sealed of God before I had met them. The argument from the history of the second visit here reaches a climax.

7. *The gospel of . . . Peter.* This of course does not mean that there are two gospels, one for Gentiles and another for Jews. Nor need it be regarded as meaning that to Paul was committed the one gospel in its completed form of adaptation to the Gentiles, and to Peter the same gospel in the less developed form most acceptable to Jews of the old school, the circumcision party, in the church. From the following context, vers. 8, 9, and from parallel places (see i. 16, with other texts referred to in note there), and from the nature of the case, it is most reasonable to conclude that *the gospel of the uncircumcision* mean. s...ply, **the evangelization of the Gentiles**, and that *the gospel of the circumcision* correspondingly means, **the evangelization of the Jews**. *Was committed:* **is committed**, or **entrusted**—another present-past.

When they saw: **having seen**: cp. in next verse *when they perceived:* **having come to know**, or, **understand**. This may have been the result simply of what he "communicated unto them" (ver. 2), viz. the "gospel he preaches among the Gentiles." But it seems more probable that they had also taken into view and consideration what Paul refers to parenthetically—mark the *for* —in ver. 8, viz. the divine attestations he had received in the manifested efficacious power of his labours.

8. *Wrought effectually . . . was mighty.* The efficacious working, or the manifested power, here was not necessarily miraculous. The same word is employed (Eph. i. 11) in relation to ordinary providence, and (Phil. ii. 13) to grace in believers. But in fact (Acts xv. 12) "signs and wonders" were at the synod known to have been divinely "wrought" among the Gentiles by

9 was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:) And when James,
Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the
grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas
the right hands of fellowship; that we *should go* unto the
10 heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only *they would*

"Barnabas and Paul." Miracles served to accredit Paul's apostleship (2 Cor. xii. 12), as they had accredited the Messiahship of Jesus (Matt. xi. 2–5). It thus seems likely that the Jerusalem leaders (ver. 9) had had them in view, and that Paul has them in view in this parenthesis. Peter, here taken as representative leader, had been accredited by miracles, of "tongues" and of healing, at the very beginning of the apostolic career.

9. *James.* See note on "James the Lord's brother" in i. 19: observe that he here is placed *first* of the "first three."

Who seemed to be pillars: the shining pillars (?). See notes on ii. 2 and 6.

And when . . . they perceived. This resumes the expression *when they saw* in ver. 7, while a transition and gain from the parenthesis is signalized by the *and*.

The grace. No doubt the "trust" in ver. 7, that is, the evangelization of the Gentiles, here (as in Eph. iii. 8) described as "a grace;" because Paul was unworthy of it, and God in love was the free giver of it.

They gave . . . fellowship: community, partnership. *Right hands:* the plural shows that all the leaders gave this token. It was not, like imposition of hands (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), a symbol of ordination to office, but a formal recognition of office already possessed. Since *Barnabas* received it, the office recognised must have been not exclusively apostleship in the strict sense, but also, perhaps simply, that of duly authorized public teachers of all grades (who had come to be leaders).

That we . . . circumcision. It is doubtful whether the ellipsis filled by our *should go* might not be better filled up: *e.g. should be* (by mutual cordial consent). The *that* means in order that, or, to the effect that. The right hands of fellowship meant, not only recognition of office, but a brotherly compact to fill the place and do the work with which the parties had been respectively entrusted by God. With this perfect good feeling of fraternity and unity, there at the same time was a confession of a diversity, which by divine authority they were constrained to acknowledge and provide for. Peter was not *then* the head of a mechanically uniform "catholic" empire.

10. *Only (they would) that . . . poor.* The italicized *they would* in our version is perhaps not perfectly happy. The *that we should remember* in another of the present-pasts, which look as if extracted from a minute of the conference. Perhaps *the poor* were especially those in Palestine, who were repeatedly, in the Apostolic Age, assisted by contributions from brethren in other lands. But there is no necessity for restricting the *memorandum* to this. Care of the poor has always been characteristic of our religion (Luke iv. 18; Matt. xi. 5; Acts vi. 1–6). It has been said that only where our religion has prevailed there have been public infirmaries for the gratuitous care of the sick, without distinction of religion or race. The *only* of our text means—though otherwise we own diversity, *here* we recognise unity alone: a fine feature in the proceedings of that momentous conference and covenant.

The same which . . . do: to do which self-same thing also I was zealous, or, hearty. Paul does not mean merely that the *memorandum* stirred him up

that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.

11 But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to
12 the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that

to forwardness in this practical interest. Before that time he had given practical evidence (Acts xi. 25, 30, and xxiv. 17) of a habitual beneficent cordiality towards the poor, especially of his own nation, where he was least favourably regarded. And after that time his mindfulness of them was evinced in appeals for collections in the Gentile churches (see in 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3, and 2 Cor. viii. 1–15). *His* "philanthropy" was not cold-blooded, "without natural affection."

Is there any natural tendency in fanaticism—hot or cold—to produce crookedness?
Why do you think so?
Why say only, remember the poor, as if that had been the only social duty everywhere and always binding?

(5.) Collision with Peter at Antioch: First Part of (ii. 11–14).

Highest proof of apostleship: not only has he been owned by them, but now he openly reproves the first of the foremost of them.

11–14. *But when . . . the Jews?* This visit is not mentioned in the Acts; nor is the mission from James. The date must have been after the Jerusalem synod, supposing Paul's visit in ii. 1 to have been on occasion of that synod. Apparently it came close upon the heels of that second visit of Paul, though this is not *quite* clear. *Peter* here is a false reading for *Cephas;* of which we have a curious illustration in the fact, that a very ancient attempt to save the apostle's credit, by making it supposed that he was not the person here, was made on the ground that the name here is *Cephas.*

11. *Antioch:* the Syrian Antioch, in which the disciples were first called "Christians," which had already become a great centre of the Christianizing movement, and in which the Judaising movement in the church had first come into collision with the Pauline evangelism, so as to occasion the Jerusalem synod.

To the face, i.e. **openly on the spot.** To prevent scandal, some would fain make the expression mean, **in appearance**—a theatrical display of contention, on the part of men who had privately agreed how the victory was to go! This is to *make* a scandal, and does not explain the text, but explains it away.

He was to be blamed: lit. **he had been condemned.** Many think he had been literally condemned by the Christians of Antioch. Others say, he had been condemned by his own conscience. And the Greek seems to admit of no translation but substantially the literal. On the other hand, what of Paul's *because* here? He cannot be understood as meaning merely that he made himself the mouthpiece either of the Christian people or of Peter's conscience. Probably our version really points to the sense, and a bridge between it and the literal translation may be found in the form, **he had done a thing deserving condemnation,** or, **had fallen (thus far) into a condemnation state.**

12. *Before that certain came from James.* **What precisely they came to**

certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself,
13 fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas

do can only be conjectured. No doubt they were important members of the Jerusalem church, of their leader's conservative type, leaning as far as possible towards the Mosaic ceremonial. But there is no need of supposing that they themselves did anything inconsistent with the decree of the Jerusalem synod. Their presence, however, manifestly occasioned a new outbreak of the exacting and oppressive Judaising temper among the Christians in Antioch, some of whom may have expected support from those important brethren from Jerusalem.

He did eat with the Gentiles: was in the way of taking meals with them. There is no need of supposing that sacramental eating is meant, though that, of course, is the highest form of representing the significance of eating together, as symbolizing community of life, and binding one to give his life for another's. Regarded simply as the closest form of natural social intercourse, unguarded "eating with" publicans and sinners had by strict religious Jews been viewed as, on Christ's part, an offence against religion (Luke xv. 1). And, as we see in the case of Peter himself (Acts x. 14, xi. 2, 3), the Jewish Christians at first had a scruple of religious conscience in relation to eating with Gentile converts, as a thing involving ceremonial defilement.

He withdrew . . . himself. Withdrew: better, kept back (as in Acts xx. 20, 27; see also Heb. x. 38). In classic Greek the word frequently has the further meaning of concealment, "keeping dark," a shade of meaning which would very well fit into all the New Testament places (cited above): thus Peter "kept dark" in a sense by *dissembling* (ver. 13). Another classic meaning of the word is "shrinking back through *fear* of another" (the Middle form with an accusative),—cowardly skulking, of which Paul expressly accuses "The Man of Rock" in the last clause of this verse. *Separated* (like *withdrew*) is in the imperfect, thus indicating a *course* of conduct—he discontinued that close form of intercourse. It does not follow that this lasted long; it may have been only beginning (as a *course* of conduct) when Paul struck in to nip the evil in the bud. Characteristic: Peter, like the Galatians, was liable to sudden transitions from fever-heat to fever-chill.

Fearing them . . . circumcision. Some have made *fearing them* to be fearing on account of them. This would meet the sense in iv. 11. But it does not meet the grammar and dictionary. And here it does not meet the sense, but supplants the sense in the interest of a dogmatic prejudice. Those of the circumcision are not simply converted Jews, but the rigorous Judaising faction, of whose temper the Antiochian brethren have had previous experience (Acts xv. 1, 2). Peter (vers. 7, 8) was the recognised chief of the Jewish section of the church. He feared to lose popularity and influence with the extremist party in this section; and he fell—not for the first time—through base fear.

13. *And the other Jews . . . with him:* not "those of the circumcision," but those who did not belong to this faction. *With him:* reasoning, what *Peter* does, surely it must be right, or at least not wrong, for us to do. *Dissembled* —they along with him. Thus far they and he were worse than the proper circumcision party, and perhaps even than the "false brethren" (ver. 4).

14 also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before *them* all, If thou, being a

Observe that the apostle, with a back-stroke, in the last word of this verse, brands their conduct as **hypocrisy** (this is the word which our version here renders *dissimulation*). Hypocrisy does not necessarily mean *conscious* concealment or falsehood. It literally means, wearing a mask, bearing a false face. One may bear a false face without knowing it; and some of those whom Christ denounced as hypocrites may have sincerely believed that they were what they wished men to regard them as being:—only their religion was *falsetto*, not what it appeared to be, though they imagined it was. Such may have been the mental condition of members of the Judaising faction in Antioch. But hypocrisy is ordinarily known and detested as involving *conscious* falseness. And this peculiarly detestable element entered into the conduct of *the other Jews* along with Peter; for *they and he did not believe* that the Judaism they practised was required by their Christian religion.

Insomuch that Barnabas . . . dissimulation. Their dissimulation: the **hypocrisy,**—the *their* is uncalled for. *Insomuch that Barnabas also:* **so that even Barnabas.** The structure of the Greek leads to the view, not that his being carried away was a *necessary* result of their conduct, but only that it *was* the result in fact: he was carried away by the current, but he might have successfully resisted its force. *Even* Barnabas—*et tu, Brute!*—points to the gravity of the crisis. He, along with Paul, has recently taken the lead in resisting the movement of Judaism in its mischievous aspects. His defection thus is peculiarly ominous of schism, between *all* converted Jews on the one hand, and on the other hand all non-conforming Gentile Christians. Then the schism, if it come, must be a very bitter one. For men like Barnabas, Peter, and "the other Jews," who notoriously believe that the Old Testament reason for formal separation has ceased to be, necessarily countenance by their conduct the suggestion that Gentile Christians are, naturally and perpetually, only as a *pariah* caste within the church; for upon their view of the abrogation of the ceremonial "partition," there can now be no other real reason for the separation. But this consequence is not that which is most formidable to Paul:—

14. *When I saw . . . gospel. Walked not uprightly:* the expression occurs only here: its literal meaning is probably **walked not straight,** so that our version is accurate. Here, again, we have a present-past—"When I saw that they walk not." *According to the truth of the gospel:* **in relation to the gospel truth.** The meaning is, that in this their walk they were personally not loyal and true to gospel truth. Some have found as the meaning, that their conduct did not go **straight towards propagation or maintenance of the truth.** Paul probably does not say this here; but he certainly has it in his view. 1. As the matter affects the gospel truth, he has a clear ground to stand upon in opposing the movement. 2. In especial, as their action is inconsistent with loyalty to the truth, he has ground, in the name of the gospel, to reprove them. But, 3. and above all, if this be so, then he is bound as Christ's true minister to oppose and reprove unshrinkingly; for in this case the movement, the conduct, constitutes a grave crisis for the whole cause of gospel truth, of Christ's glory and men's true life, in the world. (This, precisely, is what he shows in the theological part of the present

Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

Epistle.) Paul's *when I saw* is thus truly moving: compare it with his *when I beheld* in Acts xvii. 23. His *but*, too, is significant: the tide of battle was turning against the good cause,—*but* "a certain minister" stepped in.—(KNOX).

Before them all: coram ecclesiæ. "Public sin calls for public rebuke"—even if the sinner be a prince of apostles. *Peter* here, too, ought to be **Cephas.**

Being a Jew: **though a Jew.** Observe that Christians, as such, though spoken of as "Israel," as "Abraham's seed," are never spoken of as Jews. "Jews" was never the proper theological name of the chosen people. It natively refers to their physical nationality ("Jews *by nature*," ver. 15), meaning (*Judæi*) those of the kingdom of Judah, dating from the woful and shameful captivity of that kingdom, and retaining its native reference even when employed to distinguish in respect of religion between Gentiles and Abraham's seed.

Livest after . . . Gentiles: **livest in Gentile fashion.** *Livest* here, though in the present tense, of course does not describe Peter's course of life at the moment. It refers to his working *principle*, or *plan* of life, practised before, till he was driven out of it by fear of man. That principle or plan permitted Gentile fashions, including unrestrained social intercourse with Gentiles, to born Jews.

Why compellest . . . as do the Jews? For *why* a better reading is **how** (how comes it that?). *Live as do the Jews:* lit. **Judaise.** This does not mean, in every way; but only, in the way in question, specially, by submitting to circumcision. Paul makes a point by describing this as *Judaising:* he brings into view the fact that, really and in Peter's own judgment, it is **merely a Jewish custom,** and has no other decently assignable reason of existence.

Compellest: **constrainest** (*cogis*). See above note on "compelled" in ver. 3. From the circumstances we understand that it was *moral* compulsion, the constraining influence of social ostracism of the most galling sort. The unfair pressure would in severity be proportioned to the standing of those who lent themselves to the oppression. Generous Peter would thus, in effect, be the most cruel oppressor of all. It is striking, however, that what Paul here specially emphasizes is, not the lamentable consequences to the "sheep" and "lambs," so solemnly and tenderly committed to the cherishing guardianship of "Simon, son of Jonas," but his *personal* action, so disgracefully inconsistent **in a shining "pillar" of the church.**

Did generous Peter, on this occasion, "go out and weep bitterly" (*see* 1 Pet. i. 24, and 2 Pet. iii. 15)?

How can Peter's conduct be reconciled with the supposition that he was inspired of God?

How does it differ from Paul's conduct in declaring that he was a Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6)?

Is there no case in which a man may lawfully put on a false face—e.g. *stratagem in war?*

What rule is there for steering between foolish openness and sinful dissimulation?

Where does discreet reticence run into dissimulation?

15 We *who are* Jews by nature, and not sinners of the
16 Gentiles, Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have

(6.) Collision with Peter: Second Part—The Doctrinal Declaration (15–21).

Substantially a continuation of the address to Peter before the church at Antioch. Sets forth **justification by faith, not by works,** as implied in the very act of a Jew's becoming Christian, and as lying at the root of all Christian life.

15, 16. *We . . . justified.* As to *justify*, *faith*, and *law*, see Introd. pp. 32, 37, 42. Here we find **the gospel truth** which Paul saw to be affected (ver. 14). He states the doctrine of justification by faith, not as an abstract dogma, but as the living foundation of the religion professed by *Jewish* converts to Christianity. He points his statement so that it carries with it an argument *à fortiori:* if in *our* case works of law are confessedly unavailing for justification, then much more manifestly in the case of these Gentiles. And he proceeds on the fact that this bears directly on the present question about Jewish ceremonial.

15. *We . . . Gentiles. We:* You (Peter) and I, and others like us. *Jews by nature:* **born Jews.** The Greek for *by nature* here is the same as in Eph. ii. 3. In both cases it means, not by force of the constitution of man as man, yet by force of something antecedent to the individual man's articulations of conscious life and choice. And here, manifestly, as when a Spaniard speaks of "blue blood," it is intended as a claim to highest rank; as compared, for instance, with the standing of proselytes—Jews by adoption. Further, the *status* of Jew here, as contrasted with that of Gentile, is contemplated on the side of privilege and advantage enjoyed by the covenant people (Rom. iii. 2, 3, ix. 3–5).

Not sinners of the Gentiles: **from among the Gentiles.** Even the Christian Gentiles, as compared with Jews, were sinners *by nature*, in the sense of **by birth.** There is no need of supposing *irony* here. Not merely in the imagination of Judaisers, but in reality, there was a distinction, not inappropriately represented by the expression, *Jew* versus *sinner*. The word *sinner* here, as distinguished from *transgressor* in ver. 18, represents the man as **in a condition of sin,** apart from sinful acts. As contrasted with the Jews, who in a real sense were *natives* of God's kingdom (Mark vii. 27, 28; Matt. viii. 10–12), the Gentiles were born outsiders relatively to the kingdom (Eph. ii. 11, 12); "sinners" in condition as the publicans were "habit and repute" (Luke xv. 1, 2, xviii. 13); "sinners" notoriously, like her who washed the blessed feet with her tears (Luke vii. 38). It was a custom of the Jews to speak of Gentiles as *sinners*, *godless*, etc. Paul here conforms to the custom with right, and, as we shall now see, with reason, turning their speech against the Judaisers.

16. *Knowing . . . even we.* The correct reading gives us **yet knowing:**—*i.e.* high though we be in privilege and standing, **nevertheless knowing,** etc. *Knowing:* = **understanding and owning.** Though putting his theological proposition here, Paul is not to be understood as meaning that every converted Jew had the proposition full and clear before his mind at the moment of conversion. All that needs to be understood by his statement is that, as is known by Peter and "the other Jews," **the thing said in the proposition is**

believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the

implied in (a Jew's) conversion, and will be seen and confessed by the convert who intelligently reflects on the inward nature of his religion as a Christian.

A man . . . by the works of the law: **man from (out of) works of law.** No doubt the reference is primarily to "*the* law" of Moses, not excluding the moral law. But the omission of the article here is significant of the fact, a fact known to Jewish converts by experience of "*the* law," **that no such thing as law** can be the source of justification to a *man* (here = **human being**). **Works of law** are works done in obedience to law. The preposition **from (out of)** is not here important: the stress is on **works of law;** and the effect of the preposition is simply to show that **from that quarter** or **source** justification is not to be looked for.

But by the faith of Jesus Christ: lit. **only by faith of Jesus Christ:**—"that (man is justified) only," etc. *By* (faith) here makes faith to be the instrument of justification, "the open hand" which receives God's free gift. **Faith of:** faith which has Him for its object and home (John xv. 4). **Faith on Christ** (*believed in*, next clause) is faith deliberately and consciously "receiving and resting" on Him: as if the branch had gone and grafted itself on the vine. That this faith is the alone way of justification is also a thing owned and confessed by the Jewish convert who understands what is involved in his own conversion.

Even we . . . of the law: this is our deed in becoming Christians—a deed springing out of the great fact in the preceding member of the sentence, and therefore making us monuments and witnesses to that fact. *Have believed:* lit. **believed,**—there **was** this belief at the very outset of our new life.

Jesus Christ here (*not* in preceding clause) ought probably to be *Christ Jesus:* as if, some say, to show that **Messiahship** of Jesus was foremost in the view of the Jews when they believed on Him. *That:* **in order that,**—this was our motive, or end, in believing on Christ. Observe that, in going to trust on Messiah Jesus they were inwardly resolved, not only to seek justification by faith of **Messiah,** but also and equally *not* to seek it **from works of law.** *By* (faith) here is literally **from** (faith). The preposition here has primarily reference to **source;** but is sometimes employed more vaguely to indicate **occasion,** that which somehow has **led to** a thing taking place. Here, again, the stress is not on the prepositions, but on the contrasted substantives, **works** and **faith.**

Works, law, (curse): faith, Christ, (promise). On the two sides of the *colon* I have placed two triplets of correlatives: the triplets are contrasted each to each; but the relations in the one triplet correspond to the relations in the other. The analogy and contrast express the whole heart of this Epistle.

For . . . justified. This probably is a free quotation from Ps. cxliii. 2, where the Heb. is, "no living (masc.) shall be justified," and the Sept. "every living person shall not be justified." Paul here, while putting *flesh* for "living person," employs the (in Greek) uncommon turn of the Sept. expression,—meant to say, "all flesh is hopelessly beyond reach of justification." Paul at Antioch may have meant, "this thing was in our mind and heart when we first believed on Christ;" or he may have meant, "we (Jews by nature) were right in abandoning law and going to Christ, as is shown by our own Old Testament maxim." Or he may only *now* throw in the maxim by the way, to show that his argument at Antioch was warranted by Old Testament revelation.

17 works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, *is* therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

No flesh. The word *flesh*, as descriptive of mankind, has in Scripture a variety of meanings, which can be ascertained from the connection. In John's Gospel and Epistles it ordinarily means **simply human nature**, without reference to weakness or woe resulting from sin (*e.g.* in John i. 14), a meaning which perhaps would be tolerable in the present text. In the Old Testament (*e.g.* Isa. xl. 6, quoted in 1 Pet. i. 24) it represents the condition of **man** here below **as frail and evanescent**; a meaning which would perhaps suffice for ii. 20 and iv. 13 of this Epistle. But ordinarily in Paul's writings, when he is theologizing, it implies that **man is sinful and corrupt**, and this so completely that the word means **potential wickedness**, or **seat of corruption**, as (apparently) in John iii. 6. (Thus in Rom. vii. 25, and viii. 3–8.) It is in this tragic sense that the word is employed in the concluding part of this Epistle, v. 13–24, when he employs it formally and deliberately as a theological term. And probably this sense was never completely absent from his mind when the term was employed by him, the word itself ever bringing up to mind its tragic associations, even when the immediate occasion would have suggested only that manhood of nature in which the corruption inheres through sin. For a note on an unscriptural use of the distinction between "flesh and spirit," see under v. 13 and 17.

17, 18. *But if . . . transgressor.* The argument here is to us obscure, though perhaps it was clear enough to the Galatians, who may have heard Paul expound it at full length, or otherwise have had some full account of his address to Peter at Antioch. In order to see the meaning of it, we must seek and find the right point of view. I understand Paul as, while speaking in the first person so as not needlessly to wound Peter, yet really effecting a *reductio ad absurdum* of Peter's position. Peter, *seeking* justification by faith, is *found* (mark the contrast with *seeking*) himself *a sinner* (like *the Gentiles*, ver. 15). That is, his legalism in form is warrantable only on the supposition that (notwithstanding faith in Christ) he has *need* of law works for justification; and he who has need of anything for justification, who is not completely justified, is (so far), like unconverted Gentiles, a sinful outsider. But then it is Christ that has induced him to go out into this position of naked exposure by believing; and does it not follow that Christ in this way serves to make men sinners? Certainly not. For it is not Christ that bids Peter go back to the ceremonial he forsook at Christ's bidding. It is Peter himself who ultroneously reconstructs the fabric of that ceremonial. And in rebuilding it he **shows himself, or constitutes himself**, not only, vaguely, a *sinner* (in condition), but a *transgressor* (in action). For if it was right to destroy it, he transgresses in rebuilding it; and if it be right to rebuild it, then he transgressed in destroying it, and **continually transgresses** by continuously destroying it,—in continuously believing on Christ for justification *by faith of Christ and not by works of law.*[1]

17. *If while we seek . . . by Christ.* Mark the gradation here: *seeking* to

[1] To the above view of this very difficult passage it is a real objection that in other cases, when Paul cries "God forbid," the thing he deprecates is misconstruction of *his own* professed views. But--1. No construction of the passage is unobjectionable. 2. Paul's *ordinary* way of using the expression "God forbid" does not forbid the supposition that in this case, if the connection demand it, he should have employed it in a way different from his ordinary. 3. *Dramatically*, it is Paul himself whose conclusion is repelled.

18 For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make
19 myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the

be justified, *found* sinners, *self-made* transgressors. What we *seek* is what has already been expounded as the object and end of faith. But the word **seeking** points to the very first movement or inception of Christian religion: *our* search for justification terminates *in Christ*. *Justified in Christ:* not only having **our** righteousness in Him, but (in order to justification) *ourselves* being in Him (2 Cor. v. 17, 18): *this* is what we seek, in so far as we have even an elementary commencement of faith. (Cp. justified "*in*" law, iii. 11.)

Are found sinners: lit. **have been found sinners.** The *finding* is in the past (aorist) indicative. It took place as soon as Peter declared for law in addition to Christ: then it became manifest, supposing he was right in that declaration, that Christ needs to be supplemented, and so, that the Christian is thus far in a condition of sin. Thus, with Peter, separating from "sinners of the Gentiles," it is *Satan* rebuking sin (where, in truth, there is no sin).

Ourselves. The very persons who make a religion of their separation from Gentiles, on the ground that these are "sinners" (ver. 15).

God forbid! lit. **Be it not!** Horror-struck deprecation. Another such expression in Matt. xvi. 22, where Peter is detected as "*Satan* rebuking sin" (**where there is the Sinless One**).

18. *For . . . transgressor.* For the whole sentence see above note on 17, 18. The *for* gives the reason for the *God forbid! If I build:* **go on building** (?). *The things:* **those (same) things.** *I make,* or **show,** lit. **constitute.** The precise meaning is dependent on the connection: *make* is a good rendering, if we remember that one of its meanings is *make out.*

Myself is here = **mine own self:** it is not Christ's doing, but mine own.

19. *For . . . God.* Here, too, as might be expected from the *for,* the meaning arises to view from the connection. The *I* is very emphatic: not only, generally, "we" (you Peter, and the rest of us), but **I Paul:** "In *my* case it is clear (1) that he who rebuilds the law transgresses in rebuilding it, and (2) that he who depends on the law is so far hopelessly a sinner. For *I,*" etc. *Through the law am dead to the law:* **died to law** (and that) **through law;** but the order in our version is best thus far, that it makes the *law's office* here to be foremost. *By law* Paul died to law. He died to law when (ver. 16) he abandoned hope of justification by the works of it: he then died to it as a covenant of works. This fully provides for the exigency of the place; and to throw in more would probably impoverish the passage by introducing vague confusion, as when a river's banks are destroyed through over-affluence, and the stream-blessed land becomes a dead sea or pestiferous swamp. *Through law:* **law was the instrumental cause** of his death to law. Some explain thus:—The schoolmaster (iii. 24), by his very success in teaching us, makes us to outgrow him; so that thenceforward he no longer exists to us *as schoolmaster* any more than if we had died. (Thus Rom. vii. 1–3.) A deeper view is given by Paul himself, when (iii. 10) he represents the law as having only a *curse* (to those who trust in works of law for justification). (See the powerful statement in Rom. vii. 9.) The law, when really apprehended in its heart-searching depth and breadth and height, breaks the heart of *man's* hope of achieving any justifying righteousness by obedience to it. From this deeper view, and that previous one, there results a third,—showing further how the man in ver. 18 makes himself a transgressor, the view, viz.,—that *the law now forbids* man to seek life by the old way of a covenant of works. The way and

20 law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the

manner in which the law thus makes men dead to the law is set forth in Rom. v. 20, and vii. 7–11.

That I might live unto God. That: **in order that.** *Might live:* **may live (ever after)**—aorist tense. This may mean, either that the discipline of redeeming love, or that the disciple of that love, when Paul died to law by law, had this ulterior end in view—*that he may live unto God.* Certainly Paul, in passing away from the law to Christ (ver. 16), had it in view to flee from his own ragged righteousness to God's perfect righteousness. *Live unto God* has a good enough meaning here, even when only that is said:—to repose on God that confidence which the law forbade him to repose on the law, to throw upon God's strong love that life which the law will not cherish, but curses, and blights, and destroys. But *living unto God*—like *being rich toward God*, in Luke xii. 21—naturally suggests something beyond merely reposing on Him as the foundation of our life. And there is no good reason why we should not suppose that that something beyond instatement in true right of life is intended here. In the following verse we feel constrained to see as formally declared what here is naturally suggested:—that *living unto God* means not only trusting Him for life, but loving him and serving Him in life. This coincides not only with the purpose of Christ in giving us life, but with the purpose of the law in killing us. In killing us to law as a covenant of works, God has in view, as ulterior purpose, that we should honour it as a rule of life. Its purpose—as directed by God towards us—is not mere slaughter of us; but, in the first place, death of our self-confidence, and then, in the long run, or rather as a very near consequence, life in the true and noble sense of loving obedience,—life *lived* in the high sense, in consequence of life's being established on God's righteousness and rooted in His love.

20. *I am crucified . . . for me.* This expands and expounds the statement of ver. 19 about both death and life:—1. It brings fully into view, like a sun at last breaking forth in cloudless splendour, *the grand object of faith*, the foundation and sphere and source and life of life. 2. It shows us *where* and *how* Paul has died unto the law. And 3. It shows us the *living*, which was the ulterior purpose of his dying.

I am crucified with Christ. The tense here is perfect. The death is past, the life is present, the crucifixion is perfect. That is, the crucifixion is not only a fact of past time, but a fact for all time, as the water kept ever flowing from the rock from which it flowed once. Paul, once dead with Christ on the cross, is evermore **dead along with the Blessed One** on the accursed tree. Once and for ever, believing on Christ crucified, he hopes for justification from his own works of law no more than if he had been a dead man. This means, and can mean only, that he has once and for ever accepted Christ's obedience finished on the cross as the one only ground of Paul's pardon and acceptance with God. But for the present we need not dwell on the meaning of the fact; we need only emphasize the fact itself, that **on the cross** the believer has died unto the law,—become pledged never more to seek for any justifying righteousness through law-works. *This* is to be "conformed unto Christ's death."

Nevertheless . . . in me. Our version here appears to be clearly wrong in detail, though in a rough way giving the sense of the text as a whole. There

is little or nothing of reasonable doubt that the correct translation is thus: **And I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me** (laying emphasis on *I*). The best exposition here is that given by Christ Himself, in His statement about the vine and its branches (John xv. 1, etc.). The branch, though living and flourishing, has no life properly its own. The life it has and lives is properly of the vine. The theological explanation here is, that when men come to die with Christ on the cross, He comes to live in them by the Spirit. But here we are not called to dwell upon explanations, but only to emphasize the fact that—no matter how, yet somehow—*Christ* lives in those who die with Him on the cross, so that their life is no longer properly theirs, but His in them. Thus *the cross* is Paul's way, not only to death toward the law, but also to life toward God.

And the life . . . the faith. *Now*, as contrasted with the (death) *then*,—ever since Paul died unto the law on the cross. *In the flesh:* the life in it is obscured, like a prince in a mud cottage; but the natural human condition is exalted, as a certain cottage was through indwelling of heroic Christian King Alfred. *I live by the faith of:* Christ's being the life in him does not destroy Paul's own personality nor his personal agency. In this case the branch is *a person*, freely and deliberately grafting himself on the vine. The point of the present clause is, that the branch *now and ever* clings to the vine for life. Now and ever the believer lives by trusting in Christ, not only for justification, but for *all* that is implied in life to be lived by man in the flesh. His conversion was the opening of a window to let in the life-giving light of God in Christ. But the window remains open all the day: if it be shut, then comes deadly darkness.

The Son of God . . . for me. Jesus Messiah, Messiah Jesus, the Crucified One, is now solemnly described as *the Son of God*. This calls our attention, beyond the work of Christ, to His person, as object of life-giving faith,—or, rather, life-receiving faith. The description here is powerfully emphatic, well fitted to show that they who warrantably trust *in Him*—for justification, holiness, anything—shall not be ashamed. It really sets Him forth as God, the Second Person of the adorable Trinity, one in substance with the Father, His equal in power and glory. In the first sentence of this Epistle, we see Christ set forth as apparently co-ordinate with God the Father. Here we find Him set forth as really co-ordinate,—as ordinarily every son is of the same species with his father. *The* Son (*unicus*), as here employed, is itself conclusive for the deity of Jesus. This, on reflection, will be found to involve *the only-begotten* (*unigenitus*). And only-*begotten* is, in effect, eternal generation,—the Son's having His being eternally because by necessity of divine nature. "Oh, the depths!" We lose ourselves in them abstractly, but find ourselves in them concretely:—

Who loved . . . for me. *Loved me* shows that Christian life of faith, while founded on God's righteousness, is rooted in His love (Eph. iii. 18). "*Pillowed* on the strength of righteous God" does not nearly express the blissful completeness of the believer's rest in Christ: "Abide in me, and I in you" (John xv. 4). Try to think of *a soul's* roots spreading out into infinite love, which welcomes every fibre (Is. xlii. 3).

And gave himself for me. *Gave himself:* lit. **gave himself over**,—*i.e.* on the cross, on which I died along with Him. *Himself:* a *whole* Christ for every believer, as there is a whole sun for every man. *For me:* **in my room and stead.** In *for our sins* (i. 4), the preposition appropriately refers to *things*. The preposition here is one appropriately referring to *persons*. Here, there-

21 Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

fore, it is fitted to represent, relatively to the crucified Son of God, strict substitution, of person for person, life for life, death for death: "I am Thy sin; Thou art my righteousness." Faith, ultimately reposing on the person of the Son of God, and rooting in God's love, does so *through* reposing, in the first instance, on Christ's office as Redeemer and work as an atoning sacrifice.

Me . . . me. Here we have *personal* appropriation of Christ, and, beyond that, clear conviction or *consciousness* of the appropriation. This "assurance of hope" was enjoyed by Paul (2 Tim. i. 12). It is within reach of every believer who will take due pains (2 Pet. i. 10). And it is natural that Paul should assume the existence of it here, in appealing to the experience of a Christian completely formed. But it does not necessarily enter into the primary, direct act of saving faith (Acts xvi. 31). In order to be warranted in that act, all that we need to know is that the crucified Son of God, in all His glorious fulness of grace, is "freely offered to us," to all sinners of mankind, "in the gospel." The fundamental act of true faith is simply trusting in the true God (offering Himself to be our God and Saviour, on His own way of righteousness, in crucified Christ).

21. *I do not . . . vain.* In doing as above set forth, *I do not*, etc. That is, Peter and other Judaisers, so far as their conduct has any meaning, *do* frustrate, etc. *Frustrate:* lit. **displace**; the best word here is **nullify.** It thus corresponds to *in vain.* The word here is not the same as that rendered *in vain* above (ver. 2). The word here properly means **purposeless**, as if Emmanuel's death—shameful, painful, and accursed—had been really **superfluous** in the process of man's justification and salvation. *The grace of God.* While salvation, as set forth by Paul, comes to us *in* a rigorously righteous way, at the same time, as set forth by him, it comes to us *from* free and sovereign love on God's part. *For if righteousness:* the word *righteousness* here occurs for the first time. But it is in substance what we have been looking at in the word *justify* (see Introd. p. 32). Here it means, either the *result* of the justifying process, in placing a man on the footing of a servant entitled to reward, or the *ground* on which God proceeds in justifying, the legal *reason why* of the process,—most probably the latter. But the point here is, that if in *any* such sense righteousness be attainable through law, then *Christ* is superfluous. Thus Peter is not merely lighting a candle of his own, but, in effect, extinguishing the "Sun of Righteousness."

Why should there not be a pariah caste of mankind?

If there be such a caste in fact, why ought Christians not to proceed upon the fact?

If Paul's reductio ad absurdum *began with setting Peter in a position which Peter might disclaim, was Paul necessarily wrong morally in his argumentation?*

Find out in Cæsar's Gallic War *a most impressive statement, relating to Celts, of the doctrine of rigorous substitution,—of life for life, and death for death.*

Give other illustrations of the prevalence among Gentile mankind of the conviction that "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

CHAPTER III.

1 O FOOLISH Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ

(1.) The Galatians' own Experience (iii. 1–5).

Christ crucified was the grand object set forth to their view at the first; and from first to last it is the faith of Him that has been divinely attested among them by graces and miracles.

1. *O . . . among you?* There is here an abruptness of transition from what took place at Antioch, and a blunt energy of reproach, which reminds us of the "ye stiffnecked," etc. (Acts vii. 51). (The "young man" there, "whose name was Saul," bears curious features of resemblance to angel-faced Stephen.) But under the surface abruptness there lies a real continuity. Thus the *reductio ad absurdum* in ii. 17, 18 has prepared the way to the "O *foolish* Galatians" here. And the reference here to Christ crucified as having been set forth to them comes naturally and forcibly after "*I* am crucified with Christ," etc., in ii. 20.

Foolish Galatians (see Introd. pp. 17, 18).

Who . . . you. The *who* here is emphatic, as also is the *you*: "*How in the world* have *you* been bewitched?"

That ye . . . the truth is no part of the true text; probably a gloss taken in from v. 7.

Bewitched (Introd. p. 18): what is meant is fascination, as of the evil eye. Belief in the evil eye still prevails among the Celts of Brittany. Tradition says that when Columba went to Inverness for evangelization of the (Celtic?) Picts of that district, the Druids endeavoured to refute him by miracles. Ecclesiastical history translates druid into *magus* (magician). No doubt Paul alludes to the sort of fatal fascination, of forbidden "black arts," represented by druidical *hocus-pocus*. The Gaelic Bible here has a perfect translation: *Cò a chuir druidheachd oirbh? = Who has put druidism on you?* or, *Come the druid over you?*

Before . . . among you? (*Among you* is probably no part of the text, and in any case is not required for the meaning.) The clause has been very variously construed. In this verse and the following Paul is carrying back the mind of the Galatians to the state of things which existed when he was at work in their land. What he here says is: to whom was visibly set forth Jesus Christ as crucified. *Crucified* here is very emphatic: (set forth as) the Crucified One.

Set forth: lit. either fore-written or forth-written. The latter meaning is fixed as the true one by *before* (*your*) *eyes*: visibly depicted, graphically set before the eyes (some have said placarded, which seems ignoble). Paul may be thinking of the vivid delineation of Christ crucified in the picture-gospel of the Lord's Supper, as observed by an imaginative and warm-hearted people—*e.g.* at a Highland communion. He certainly has no thought of literal use of images in worship. A century after his death, Athenagoras of Athens will speak of that use of images as distinctively Pagan, abhorred by Christians; and will refute beforehand the most plausible arguments or apologies for that use which have since that time occurred to Christians wishing to break the Second Commandment.

2 hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This
only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the
3 works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so
foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect

2–5. The statement here is very important apologetically (Introd. p. 12). In detail we may see that the gift and works of *the Spirit* here include a gift and works still continuing in the church. But we certainly see that *miracles* proper were wrought. And what we see on the whole is that the gospel, among the Galatians, was **divinely attested**, and is when Paul is writing. Of this he speaks to a community where many would be glad to find him wrong, in manifest confidence that no one will think of contradicting him, while every one must know if what he says be untrue. Miracles are not now given for attestation of the gospel; for that species of attestation has been given once for all in the first age, and that which was needed for the launching of the ship (*Ecclesia*) is not needed when she is sailing on the sea. But here in the first age we see the complete divine attestation as clearly as if we had been personally present when the Galatians heard Paul's preaching and read his letter.

2. *This . . . of you:* lit. **This alone I will to learn from you.** *You* is emphatic. *Would I learn* is quite a fair rendering here of **I will to learn:** "Pray tell me, yourselves, this one thing."

Received ye . . . faith? The gift of *the Spirit* had from the beginning been recognised as divinely attesting the receiver's Christianity, and consequently settling the disputed question about Mosaic ceremonial (Acts x. 44–48, xi. 15–18, xv. 6–17). The gift which then was so recognised appears to have been, and in some cases certainly was, properly miraculous (Acts x. 46, xii. 8–11). The distinctively miraculous "gifts" were from the first intended to be superseded by the abiding "graces" of Christian character (1 Cor. xiii. 8–13), which, also supernatural in their origin, are really evidential (Eph. ii. 7; 1 John iii. 14), though not so as to supersede the abiding evidence of miracles done in the first age.

By the works . . . faith? lit. **from works of law . . . from hearing of faith?** "Is it from **works of law** (that ye received the Spirit), or (is it not) **from hearing of faith?**" See note on "from faith" in ii. 16. Here, as there, the preposition simply points to the *occasion of*, what *led to* (their receiving the Spirit). Some would prefer, **from report of faith.** *Hearing* is best: the hearing **appropriate to faith** (or **about faith** as the true way?) as contrasted with law-works. This brings into view the character of faith as **simply receptive.** The question is, What was the occasional cause of your receiving the Spirit?—and the answer, Not law-works, as if in the way of previous payment for the gift, but simple receptivity manifested in hearing (Isa. lv. 3; Rev. xxii. 17). (In Rom. x. 17 the *point of view* is not the same as here.) *The Spirit:* At a later stage we shall find Him referred to as **a person** (of the Godhead), but here there is brought into view only **supernatural** (divine) **power.**

3. *Are ye . . . flesh? So foolish:* referring to ver. 1. *Flesh:* see note on "flesh" in ii. 16. Here there is a transition to the contrast of "flesh" to "spirit," dwelt upon in v. 16–26. Paul's question implies a contrasted character of **two religions:** the one **spiritual,** because taught by the Spirit, who worketh faith, and because **this faith reposes on God alone;** the other

4 by the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if
5 *it be* yet in vain. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, *doeth he it* by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

carnal, because doctrinally it is an unauthorized invention of man, and because practically it means reliance on man instead of God. The question is, in effect, "Are you so *very* demented, that, having at first relied **on God only**, you now rely **on man?**" *Made perfect:* In the present tense, (now) **being made perfect**, (now) **seeking completion**; as if the ship launched by God were now to sail the seas without God. To be *completed* in the *flesh* is a shameful anti-climax on the part of men who have so much as *begun* in the Spirit. *Now:* emphatic. *In the Spirit . . . in the flesh:* lit. **in** (or **by**) **Spirit . . . in** (or **by**) **flesh.** In the Greek there is no preposition, but only what is called a dative of manner; a fair rendering would be, **spiritually . . . carnally** (fair, but feeble).

4. *Have ye . . . in vain?* Lit. **did ye**, etc.? Some take this as referring to **a martyr-life** of Galatian Christians; others, as referring to **some one notable persecution** undergone by them. The natural suggestion in this place is that the apostle simply means, **Have you had such great experiences?** The word for *suffering* here means natively **experience.** Ordinarily, in relation to man's lot (prevalently woful), **experience of evil.** But in the present text (as also in Acts ix. 16, about the matter of which *Paul* is not likely to be unmindful), it is perhaps best to regard the word as meaning **experience** simply=here, "that wonderful experience of yours, relatively to the Spirit and His work, when you first heard the gospel and saw its attestations."

In vain? The word here is not the same as in ii. 2 and ii. 21 (see notes on the word in those places). Perhaps the best translation here would be **to no purpose** (with **fruitlessly** in ii. 2, and **superfluously** in ii. 21).

If (it be) yet in vain. **If indeed (it be) in vain:** = "If, alas! I must use the word *in vain* (when speaking of your wonderful experiences)," or, "If this *in vain* be *the worst.*"

5. *He therefore . . . of faith? Therefore:* **well, then** — resuming the thread of argument, after the sorrowful exclamation in ver. 4. *He:* that is, God (ii. 8). Probably the work here described was going on at the moment of Paul's writing. But the present tense may refer only to the *general* question—"What about the great giver and worker in *your* experience?" (Does *He* give the Spirit and work miracles in connection with my gospel of faith, or in connection with the Judaising doctrine of works?)

Ministereth to you the Spirit. The word for *ministering* here means nothing lower than **supplying.** In Attic Greek it appropriately described the rich man who provided certain public entertainments *at his own expense.* God is thus here set forth as ministering, not in a servile way, but in the lordly way in which a householder ministers to his household. *The Spirit:* not necessarily as a source of miraculous "gifts:" the ministration has place and effect in the case of ordinary "graces." *To you:* the *you* is somewhat emphatic.

Worketh miracles among you. Among you: lit. **in you.** The preposition here, ordinarily meaning **in**, often has the meaning of *among* (*i.e.* **in** *the community*, though perhaps *not* in every individual addressed). Thus, in the case of *miracles:* here lit. **powers (works of power) superhuman or divine.** The evidential value of miracles depends upon their being **powerful** works (of

6 Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to
7 him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which

such power as to be manifestly supernatural). It is thus only that they can be properly *wonders*, such that our attention is constrained towards them, as if we had seen a man floating in the air; and *signs*, pointing to superhuman or divine intervention in ordinary world history. For **worketh** here see note on "wrought," etc., in ii. 8.

(*Doeth he it*) . . . *of faith? Doeth he it:* or something equivalent, will be understood as indispensable by an English reader though our version should leave it out. See above note on "*He*" in this verse. "The minister and worker—**from law's works or faith's hearing (from which)?**"

("*Foolish.*") *As to "the fool" of the Bible,—show that a hard heart is what makes a soft head.*

Since Paul here appeals to experience of the Galatians, why not make the Church an authority? Can there be a legitimate witness for doctrine that is not a source of doctrine?

(*In relation to Christian evidence:*) *If "gifts" were necessary then, why not now? If "graces" be sufficient now, why not then?*

(2.) The Typical Case of Abraham (6–9).

His case is typical: *i.e. believers* are the true Abrahamites. (Regarding the complementary proposition, *workers* are the true Abrahamites, see Introd. pp. 36, 37.)

6. *Even as Abraham believed God* (Gen. xv. 6). *Believed:* **exercised faith on.** The connecting word here is **faith**, *believing*. The meaning is, not simply that faith ultimately reposes on God (ii. 20), but that this *faith* (versus *works*), which characterised the Galatians' first experience of Christian religion, had in like manner characterised the religion of Abraham: **his religion**, like theirs, **was a religion of faith**,—"even as *Abraham* believed," etc. It is the faith that *made* him: (James will tell us that it was works that *showed* him.) The text bids us look on faith as *the* thing in Abraham's case (from the view-point of the question now in hand, about justification before God).

And it was accounted . . . righteousness: for this see Introd. pp. 35, 36. But I here give, as my opinion, that the *it was accounted* here is impersonal: = "there was an accounting to him for righteousness: there took place a declaration or imputation of righteousness." This seems *too* simple: so does light.

7. *Know ye therefore . . . of Abraham.* (See Rom. iv. all through.) *Know ye therefore:* **well, then, you see**; or better, **make up your minds** (to this) **then.** *They which are of faith*: **the men of faith, those whose religion is distinctively faith.** *These:* emphatic: "the men of faith, *they* are *Abraham's* sons." That is, they alone. A true son is of the same nature with his father; and Abraham's nature consisted in faith—*ergo*. Those who are not of faith may imagine that physical descent makes spiritual affinity (John viii. 33–41). But in truth physical descent (*ibid.* 44) is compatible **with a far different spiritual parentage.**

8 are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the
Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen
through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham,
9 *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they
which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.
10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the

8. *And the Scripture . . . blessed. And:* **further** (?). *The Scripture* = *the* oracular book, to which we all appeal as divine. Here *the Scripture* (as in Heb. iv. 12, 13, *the word of God*, not the *word* spoken of in Heb. xi. 3) is made **a person**: is it not the person in John i. 1, etc.? though such theologizing is perhaps not now express in Paul's mind. *Foreseeing* here is followed by a present tense (the **prophetic** Scripture says),—**that God justifies.** The foresight springs from **insight**: Scripture sees the future events in their eternal principle,—God's will to justify (only) in the one way of faith:—**that from faith** alone God justifies. This argument from the nature of Abraham's religion is warranted by the fundamental scriptural record (Gen. xii. 3) of God's promise to mankind through him: where we read "families," not "nations." Since the blessing to them was destined to be "in" him, it follows that the religion of the blessed ones must be of the same nature with his. *In thee* is emphatic. *Be blessed:* **obtain the blessing**,—justification (ver. 11). *All nations:* **not** necessarily **all individuals** in those nations:—*singula generum* is different from *genera singulorum*. "The *catholic* blessing shall be in thee,"—*therefore*, concludes Paul, the blessing to *the Gentiles*.

9. *So then . . . Abraham. So then:* **so that**. *Are blessed* (present tense): **are** (at this hour) **being blessed**: the blessing evermore keeps coming on this way (of faith). *Of faith:* here, too, is lit. **from** (or **out of**) **faith** (faith is the proximate source of their life). *With* = **along with** (on the same footing, as well as in company). *Faithful Abraham:* **Abraham the believer—the man of faith.** The word for "faithful" here is the same as in 1 Cor. i. 9: "the friend of God" thus has the same description with God. But in 1 Cor. i. 9 the word can mean only **reliable**, while here it manifestly means **relier**. (On *reliance* as essence of "faith," see Introd. p. 37, etc.) But *faithful Abraham* here means more than simply, that Abraham was a relier even as God is the Reliable One. It means, as above set forth, that faith was the characteristic, the constitutive essence, of Abraham's life of religion, as typical of all true religion: **Abraham the man of faith.**

In the representative act of Abraham's faith (Rom. iv.), *what is it that shows that his reliance was on God as almighty?*

Give a case of a miracle in Christ's work showing reliance on His omnipotence.

How do you understand the word of Christ, "Abraham saw my day, and was glad?"

(3.) Corroboration by the Law (10–14).

The law itself forbids to men every hope of life on the ground of obedience to its precepts.

10. *For . . . do them. For: i.e.* to show cause for what is conveyed in vers. 8, 9, that *only* believers are Abraham's blessed seed, that faith *alone*

curse: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to
11 do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, *it is* evident: for, The just shall live by faith.

justifies. *As many as:* **such as.** They are the only *other* class. *Are of the works of the law:* **are of (from, or out of) law-works: the men of law-works** (who rely upon these), in **contradistinction to the men of faith** (who rely only on God). *Are under the curse:* **are (brought) under curse.** The preposition here is one of **motion**, terminating in **being under** something. Its peculiar significance will be illustrated in notes on vers. 22, 23 of this chapter. Here we need say only, that **brought under curse** fairly represents the meaning; though the emphasis is not on *brought*, nor on *under*, but on *curse* (as contrasted with *blessing*, above). The *the* (curse) of our version is not in the original text, and seems to cloud rather than to illuminate the meaning. "As to the men of law, *their* position (to which they have been brought) is **under curse**,"—not one of benediction, but one of malediction. Cp. Heb. xii. 18–21, with its awful suggestion, of men's (coming to be) **under** the cloud of God's wrath, with its hoarse thunders and fierce lightnings. "*This* is what your sham gospel, of legalism, results in,—if the law itself speak true." *Curse:* see note on *anathema* in i. 8, 9. The word here is not "anathema," but one meaning **express declaration** of divine consuming wrath.

For it is written: perfect tense = **God's mind set down in writing**, once and for ever. *Cursed* is, etc. The O. T. Scripture quoted here (Deut. xxvii. 26) has in Sept. **every human being.** The whole passage (Deut. xxvii. 11–26) is overwhelmingly impressive, especially when we come to find God's awful curse solemnly responded to (endorsed) by the **Amen**! of His whole covenant people, who are in the very act of formally renewing their covenant with Him. *Continueth . . . to do:* of course there is no real continuance in a law unless one do what it prescribes. *Written:* **clearly and formally declared.** *In the Book:* **solemnly recorded** among the archives of God's kingdom. (There thus can never more be pleadable any mistake about the Lawgiver's meaning; for He Himself has recorded His own definition of His meaning,—as regards our duty.) *All things:* the *all* is wanting in the Heb., but is implied in the nature of law as a covenant of works: to break one, even the least of its precepts, is to break with the law, to make oneself an outlaw, or violator of law as such. Then the obedience required, thus **complete in breadth**, is shown to be **complete in duration** by the *continueth not:* for one under a covenant of works to break down at any moment of life, though it should be the last, is to be lost, under the curse; as a ship is lost that sinks anywhere, though it should be when the sailors are casting anchor in the haven after having sailed round the world.

11–13. *But . . . tree.* In ver. 10 it is shown that the law has only a curse for the man who does not always keep all its precepts. Now the apostle (whose *but* here = **moreover**, or **and further**) goes on to show that even if a man should keep them all, the law has for him no justification. His process of proof is this: 1. It is (only) by faith that justification comes; but 2. the law has to do, not with faith, but with doing; therefore, 3. there is no justification for man by the law. And the argument is corroborated by the fundamental fact of our religion, that **Christ** (not **the law**) has redeemed us, etc.

11. *But* (here = **moreover**, or **and besides**) . . . *by faith.* On the great

12 And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them
13 shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written,

sentence, *The just shall live by faith*, see Introd. p. 35. Some would prefer, **The just-by-faith shall live.** Others would have **loyalty** in Hab. ii. 4 instead of *faith:* a rendering which certainly is inadmissible in the New Testament passages; and which the Sept. seems to provide against by throwing in a my,—(my) faith, **the faith which reposes on God** (?). The *just* here is simply **the righteous man:** there is no necessity for making it **the justified man**; and there is a clear advantage in holding by the simple meaning. ("A really honest man will proceed on this way of life.") In the present text the whole stress is manifestly thrown upon *faith* (as contrasted with works of law). In illustration of what is said in the Introduction about the possible peculiarly close relation of Celtic Christianity to this Epistle and the churches addressed in it, take this, the only surviving, fragment of (Celtic) Culdee preaching: "Not the man is justified by his righteousness, but the righteous man shall live by his faith." Lay due stress on **faith**, and serious misconstruction becomes impossible. *No man:* **no one.**

Justified . . . live. Justification is *the condition* of all true life; therefore, justification by law is impossible if it be true that life is only by faith. *In the sight of God:* **Before God, as if sitting in judgment.** *Is evident:* **for** (no need of the *It*): **the Old Testament** has declared this, as to the real condition of life. *Justified by:* lit. **justified in.** "The system of things constituted by law results in justification to no one."

12. *And . . . them. And:* better, **but** (or **now**?). *Not of faith:* lit. **not from** (or **out of**) **faith.** The O. T. has said, emphatically, "*of faith.*" But "the law" does not conform to this condition. As a system **it does not spring from faith**, nor **from the doctrine that faith is the condition of life.** *But:* **on the contrary** (so far from its being true that the law is **from faith**, the truth regarding the law is that), *the man that doeth:* lit. **he that did, the doer** (of),—(not the one that relies, but the one that works). *Them . . . them* (Rom. x. 5; Lev. xviii. 5, read also 1–4), *i.e.* the "statutes" and "judgments" of Jehovah. *In them* here means by or **through them.** The possession of Canaan, referred to in Lev. xviii. 1–5, was secured to Israel by a veritable covenant of works; thus far, that the temporal benefits of that possession were, by God, made dependent on Israel's accepting *His* declared will as the rule of life, and *not* following the customs of idolatrous Egyptians and Canaanites. It does not follow that even those blessings came to them as the proper reward of obedience regarded as meritorious. But the utterance here quoted by him suffices for his present purpose,—viz. to show that (relatively to justification) **the way of law is different from and opposite to that of faith;** for on that (old) way of law the covenanter had to depend on his obedience, while on the way of faith he is allowed to depend only on God's grace.

13. *Christ . . . tree.* There is an abruptness of transition here which serves to strengthen Paul's emphasis. The emphasis is laid on *Christ* (as contrasted with *the law*): all the rest is only supposition of **what Christ is**, in this relation (and, consequently, **what Christians are**): He, *Redeemer* (and, consequently, they redeemed). *Redeemed:* lit. **bought back**, ordinarily, from slavery or death. Appropriately, in N. T., **delivered** (us from death in sin) **by price-payment** (of His life as a ransom). Every vaguer meaning here is excluded

14 Cursed *is* every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

by the strain of the passage. *Us:* somewhat emphatic=(probably) **even us** ("Jews by nature"). But the great point here is, **It is Christ** (that has redeemed); or, **Christ's great work has been** (redemption). *Hath redeemed*, is lit. **redeemed**=what Christ accomplished in dying.

The curse . . . curse for us. The word for *curse* here is the same as in ver. 10 (see note there). *The curse* is evidently **that pronounced** as in ver. 10. It thus, no doubt, has direct and special reference to those who were formally under the law (Rom. iii. 19). But what the law said of them is true of all men. Witness the fact that *Christ redeemed, etc., being made a curse for us:* **having become a curse for us**=through becoming **a curse for us**,—it was **in this way** that He redeemed us. The preposition *for* here, as above in ii. 20 (lit. **over**, as a shield, or a hen covering her chickens with her life), is the one appropriated for strict substitution, of life for life, death for death. **His** being **made a curse** is like His being "made sin" in 2 Cor. v. 21. (Cp. note on *accursed* in Gal. i. 8, 9, where the word is different, but the abstract form "a curse"—instead of "accursed"—is the same.) "He redeemed us by undergoing God's wrath as our substitute." This includes deliverance *to Jews* from the specialties of their bondage as formally under the law; but the great thing it includes is deliverance (for all His redeemed) from the penal consequences of sin (which are most clearly declared by "the law").

For it is written . . . on a tree. For = Scripture (O. T.) proof that the Blessed One was made a curse. The reference is to Deut. xxi. 23. The "tree" here is **not the cross.** Death by the cross was not a Jewish mode of punishment. In Deut. xxi. the criminal is supposed to have been put to death in the customary manner before being hanged on the tree (which was not cruciform, but simply a stake, to which the corpse was tied by the hands). *Hanged*=**impaled.** The intention of the impalement (after death) was to signify **infamy** of dying. Thus *cursed is every one* means **infamous in death is every one.** In Deut. it is **God** that declares the infamy. Paul's argument is that **God**, in permitting His Son to die an infamous death before men, made it to appear that in the Son's experience of death (Heb. ii. 9) there was a veritable infamy before God; so that the very manner of His dying was an indication of His being truly "made a curse."

14. *That . . . that.* The *that* in both cases means **in order that.** The two things thus introduced may be simply co-ordinate, as both alike intended results of Christ's work in ver. 13. But probably it is better to regard the *promise of the Spirit* here (as in iv. 6) as consequent on *the blessing of Abraham*, though necessarily accompanying it in the purpose of redeeming love.

That the blessing, etc.: He *a curse*, in order that for us *the blessing of Abraham* (ver. 8), *i.e.* **justification** specially: this is the blessing which the Gentiles were destined to obtain in Abraham. *On the Gentiles:* not simply **all peoples**, but distinctively **the heathens** (when converted)—as well as the Jews, *through Jesus Christ:* lit. **in Jesus Christ.** (See note on "in Christ" in ii. 17.)

That we might . . . through faith. Promise of the Spirit: not **promise made by the Spirit**, but the Spirit (with **His gifts and graces**) as promised.

15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though *it be*
but a man's covenant, yet *if it be* confirmed, no man dis-
16 annulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his
seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds,

(See above notes on "Spirit" in vers. 2, 5.) *Promise*=**thing promised** (*promissum*), as in Heb. xi. 39. *Through faith:* the purpose was not only that the "blessing should be found by us *in Christ*, but also that the Spirit" should be given to us *through faith*. *We:* here, **not** (distinctively) **Jews**; but, generally, the **redeemed**, all made one in Christ by the Spirit.

If the gift of the Spirit is through faith, how can faith itself be a gift of the Spirit?

"The just shall live by faith": why not understand this as meaning, "The loyal and true man, he shall live"?

If Canaan was a type of heaven (Heb. iv. 8), *how can the tenure of Canaan have been through a covenant of works?*

Give parallels to impalement (in Deut. xxi.) *as meaning peculiar infamy of death: one ancient, and one modern.*

(4.) The Abrahamic Covenant (15–18).

This, the fundamental declaration of religion from God for mankind, remains unchanged notwithstanding "the law," which is only an evanescent episode on the face of God's dispensations.

15. *Brethren:* kindly returning to a milder mode of address.

I speak . . . men: i.e., in what follows, reasoning from the **analogy** of an ordinary human transaction,—a man's covenant.

Though (*it be*) *but . . . yet* (*if it be*). The Greek form here has no corresponding idiom; our version gives good English for the Greek. The idea is that of the sacredness of a covenant, as exhibited (though, in fact, not invariably, yet sufficiently for the purpose of illustration) in the case of *a man's* covenant; and, of course, much more to be supposed in the case of a divine covenant.

Covenant: lit. **disposition**,—the law (Latin) word "disposition" giving a very good meaning for the Bible word (O. T. and N. T.), as a thing determined *by express will*. The Bible covenant does not necessarily imply the will of two parties. What it necessarily implies is *will*, freely undertaking an engagement (to bless). When specially connected with death (*e.g.* of Jesus, Heb. ix. 16, 17), the word, generally meaning **disposition**, naturally attains to the affecting significance of **testamentary disposition**. But this specialty of meaning (=**testament**), not permitted in Gal. iii. 15, is perhaps not called for anywhere in the N. T.

No man . . . thereto: **no one cancels, nor adds provisions to.** That is, in the ideal case, of a covenant fairly *confirmed*=**made definitive.**

16. *Now to Abraham . . . Christ:* that is, in the case of the Abrahamic covenant there was a veritable, definitive disposition on God's part. But the main point here is, that this, on God's part, was *to Abraham and his seed. His seed*, from position, is strongly emphatic: "Not only *to Abraham*, but also and especially TO HIS SEED." *Were the promises made:* **the promises were expressly declared** (by God); so that here there was a veritable *covenant*,

as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.
17 And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the

admitting no abrogation nor addition. *Promises*, plural, because the fundamental promise was often repeated in Abraham's experience (Gen. xii. 7, xv. 5, 18, xvii. 7, 8, xxii. 18). *The promises: these* were made *the* matter of covenant: there was a true covenanting, of which *promise* (=promises) was *the* characteristic (Eph. ii. 12).

He saith not: there is no pronoun in the Greek. In point of mere grammar, the translation might have been, *it* (*e.g.* the Scripture, ver. 8) *saith not.* But our translators appear to have been rightly guided here, by the great emphasis laid on *covenant* and *promise*, to making the speaker to be **God.**

To seed . . . to seeds. Of many . . . of one: is here lit. **over many . . . over one,** as if in the attitude of one **solemnly pronouncing**, or **pouring down**, the blessing. The Hebrew word for *seed*, in the passages referred to here, hardly admits of any plural form (like our *seeds*, when we speak, say, of sown grains of corn). Paul has therefore been blamed by some commentators as reasoning illogically, or playing the rabbi, or not carefully considering the meaning of the text he reasons from. Probably Paul knows what he is about better than the said commentators. The force of his reasoning here depends, not on the mere dictionary *word* "seed," but upon the great Scriptural *idea* which, more and more clearly in O.T. revelation, becomes manifested through that word; the idea of an individual person, who should sum up in Himself the covenant people ("seeds"?) as well as (for them) the covenant blessings (1 Cor. xii. 12)—that is, the promised Messiah, *Christ:*—

Which is Christ: **Who is Christ.** The *which* here is masculine in the Greek, though the *seed* is neuter. It is a recognised Greek usage to make the *which* of the same gender with *Christ.* And here it has the happy effect of setting forth *Messiah, the* one promised of God as the *seed*, in whom all God's Israel come to be also the *seed* (ver. 29).

17. *And this . . . effect.* (The *in Christ* here has not good textual authority.) *And this I say:* **and this is the thing I say**—"(The) covenant . . . (the) law does not disannul"—direct oration, reasoning from the nature of the case as set forth in vers. 15, 16. The *the* before *covenant* is not in the Greek; and perhaps had better be left out of the English: even a (covenant) . . . **the** (law) would perhaps better bring out the point here: **my position is,** "Covenant (so confirmed) the law (coming in long after) does not disannul."

Confirmed before of God: (long) **previously made definitive by God** (Himself).

The law, which was . . . after: **the law, coming into being . . . after.** *Cannot disannul:* lit. **does not disannul:** *i.e.* the nature of the case here excludes disannulment. The root word for *disannul* here is the root word for *confirm*, this verse and ver. 15: "What God long before established (validated), the law does not disestablish (invalidate)."

That it should make the promises . . . effect: **to the effect of bringing the promise to nought.** *Make . . . of none effect:* the expression here is that rendered bring to nought in 1 Cor. i. 28. *The promise:* that which was the constitutive essence of the covenant.

18 promise of none effect. For if the inheritance *be* of the law,
it is no more of promise: but God gave *it* to Abraham by
promise.
19 Wherefore then *serveth* the law? It was added because of

Four hundred and thirty years. The four hundred years in Acts vii. 6, and Gen. xv. 13, is a round number. Paul here adopts the precise number in Ex. xii. 40. Even with this explanation, there is much difficulty in relation to Scripture statements about the number of those years. Probably they are reckoned from Abraham's time, so as to include the whole period of the *wandering* of God's people. But Paul here has no occasion for minute antiquarian investigation. He takes a well-known Bible statement, which suffices for his argument: "Covenant, *so long* established by authority of God, the law cannot destroy in its essence (of promise)."

18. *For if . . . by promise. The inheritance,* as appears from the promises to Abraham, included primarily Canaan with its temporal blessings, but fundamentally and permanently meant the spiritual blessings which Abraham had by faith. The word for *inheritance* easily gathered into itself the idea of good enjoyed by us (independently of our personal endeavours, and so) as the result of fatherly goodness in God. But in the present text the strong word is *promise . . . promise* (as contrasted with *law*): "if *by law*, then not *by promise;* now it is in the way of *promise* that God gave to Abraham." The word for *promise* here is in Scripture employed almost, if not quite, invariably to describe the expression of gracious free will **in God.** So, *Gave (it) to Abraham* is lit. **God (graciously) gifted (it) to Abraham.** *By promise:* lit. **through promise**—"by this way (of God's own making), not by the way of man's meritorious law-works." The effect of the sentence is, **the very genius of the Abrahamic covenant is promise**; so that any infusion of legalism would have been destructive of that covenant, which is first (in Abraham), and therefore last, abiding, permanent (in his seed, who is Christ).

How can a seed which is one person be at the same time one people?
The ideal of a man's covenant being definitiveness in provisions, how does it appear that the true ideal of covenant is realized in God's covenant with Abraham?
Regarding the 430 years, find out the difficulties in Scripture chronology here, and judge what is the best way of dealing with them.
Why should not the law displace the Abrahamic covenant?
As to inheritance: the root of the word means lot; what is there common to "lottery" and divine free will?

(5.) Use of the Law (19–25).

That it has a use, shown by its lofty place. That use not the achievement of a justifying righteousness of man, but man's preparation for receiving the righteousness of God.

19. *Wherefore then . . . the law?* lit. **what then (is) the law?** "*What* purpose does it serve?" That is, in the present relation, to a sinner's justification before God. Of its use as **a rule of life to the justified man** (v. 14) **this is not the place to speak.**

transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a

It was added . . . transgressions: lit. **it was superadded (for the sake of =) with a view to the transgressions.** The *super* refers to its being no part of the original and unchanging Abrahamic covenant. The end in view here, **for the sake of** which it was given, was, not the repression of transgressions, nor the punishment of transgressors, but, as in Rom. v. 20, 21 **(the transgressions)**, the outgoing manifestation, in individual actions or habits, of man's inward disposition or character as depraved and sinful. Thus by the law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. iii. 20). The suggestion here, that without express and formal declaration of law (such as the Mosaic legislation), there could have been no *transgressions* properly speaking, is quite uncalled for by the text, and condemned by Scripture (Rom. i. 32, ii. 14, 15) and common sense. To make the transgressions only those which violated some express precept, is arbitrary at best.

Till the seed should come . . . made: lit. **aye and until the seed may come to whom promise has been made.** The apostle is looking forward from the time of the legislation. *Till* = **up to the point of time when.** *The seed* is **Christ** (ver. 16, see note). While the proximate purpose of the legislation is the transgressions, the ulterior end is (preparation for) Christ. (Rom. x. 4.) Therefore the law must have gone on serving that proximate purpose, aye and until He have come "to finish the transgression," etc. (Dan. ix. 24).

And it was ordained . . . mediator: lit. **being ordered (arranged and administered) by angels, in hand of a mediator.** The general purpose here is to show, not only the glory of the law, but also and especially the manner in which it was *brought home* to men as from God; hence *being*, = by this manner it was fitted for the purpose, to elicit transgressions.

Ordained by angels: by = **through means of.** *Angels:* lit. **messengers.** The class of "messengers" intended here, the "angels" commonly so called, did not stand in peculiarly close relation to the Mosaic legislation as distinguished from other parts of God's revelations to His ancient church: in fact, the O. T. angelophanies were most frequent before the time of that legislation. "Disposition of angels" (lit. "dispositions"), in Acts vii. 53, may be fairly construed as only more vaguely referring to what (*ibid.* vers. 30, 35, 38) Stephen had more precisely specified before, viz. the deed of that Angel who spoke to Moses in the bush, *i.e.* the Messiah, or Jehovah the covenant God; while the expressions in our text and context must be regarded as parallel to those other N. T. passages in which "angels" are spoken of as inferior to the Messiah or Christ. The instrumentality of angels is spoken of here, not as contrasting the Mosaic legislation with earlier revelations of God, but as characterising, in a manner and measure familiar to the Hebrew mind, that whole epoch of revelation in which "the law" came to be the outstanding feature, so as to give its own name to the whole. And their "ordering," thus characterising the dispensation of law, while constituting a feature of contrast to the new dispensation of grace (2 Cor. iii. 6–10), was at the same time a circumstance of glory to the law, as well as a means of bringing it home to man.

In (the) hand of a mediator: presumably, **Moses**: it will be remembered that the fundamental law, the Decalogue, came literally in his *hand*, on the stony tables, from heaven to the people. In contrast to him, Christ is known to believing Hebrews (Heb. viii. 6, xii. 24) as Mediator of a "new" and

20 mediator. Now a mediator is not *a mediator* of one, but

"better" covenant. His name is not given, probably because his name would not be here significant for the apostle's purpose,—which is, simply to point to the circumstance of *human mediation*, as a feature of the O. T. revelation of law. *In* (*the*) *hand* shows that, while there was an angelic instrumentality, it is distinctively by the human mediator that the laws were "handled," or administered in immediate application to the people on earth,—it was through him that the people transacted this great business with God: if angels brought the laws, or served in bringing them, from heaven to the holy mount, it was the Mediator that brought them (thus received from God) to Israel on the plain. The instrumentality of angels is consistent with the fact that (Deut. xxxiv. 10) Moses, as compared with other prophets, received his revelations *immediately* from God. There seem to have been occasions (Ex. xxxiii. 11) on which no creature medium intervened, as revealing veil, in his vision of the Creator. But there were occasions on which there did intervene an Angelic medium (Acts vii. 30, etc.; Ex. iii. 2). And although, as a rule (Acts vii. 53), he had received the ordinances through the medium of angels, the revelations given to him would have been immediate *as compared* (Deut. xxxiv. 10) with those given to the subsequent prophets; for all subsequent prophets received their visions, so to speak, through the medium of the great Legislator,—the Mosaic revelations being always presupposed in the divine communications made to them. *Mediator*, thus, while compatible with comparative inferiority (to Christ), is still a feature of glory in "the law;" for, no matter who or what the mediator may be, the very fact of mediatorship shows that the law, attended with pomp of angelic instrumentality, is fundamentally and properly from God: only thus it serves its purpose, conviction of sin; it reaches us by coming through angels and man, but convicts us only as coming from God—witness the thunders and lightnings.

20. *Now a mediator . . . is one.* Of this text there have been several hundreds of explanations; from which it follows that no one explanation can be hazarded without diffidence. At the same time, an explanation is not to be shrunk from merely because it has difficulties; for if there had been any one without difficulty, then there would not have been several hundreds promulgated, but only that one. On the other hand, in such a case as this, we must be on our guard against expecting great difficulties or profundities, so that an explanation shall appear to us suspicious in proportion to its ease and simplicity. The following explanation has been suggested simply by the text:

The statement is apart from the main stream of the apostle's argumentation about law. It is an eddy, or episodical note, upon what is itself only a secondary feature of the representation in ver. 19, viz. the circumstance of mediatorship in the revelation of law. We have already referred to the fact that mediatorship implies that the fundamental and primary legislator is God. But mediation implies something more than this: *a mediator is not of one: i.e.* mediation implies more than one party. *But God is one:* God is one party (only); so that there must be another. And that other is not far to seek. It is not constituted by the angels; for they are not a separate party, but only accessories on God's part. The other party is the covenant people. As (through Moses) God was one party, giving the law, so (through Moses) they were another party, receiving the law. In a note on the law's curse, ver. 13, I have referred to the circumstance that they were in this way formally and solemnly made a party, in relation even to its curse, when renewing their

21 God is one. *Is* the law then against the promises of God?
God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could
have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the
22 law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that

covenant. The circumstances of the covenanting at Sinai show that they were then and there made a party, as truly as if they had responded with the solemn "Amen!" of Shechem. And the fact that *they*, too, were a party, is not insignificant in relation to the law's purpose, conviction of sin.—I thus regard the statement as a suggestive "aside," occasioned by the allusion to the fact of mediatorship, a fact which itself is here only circumstantial; so that the main stream of discourse, deflected from in that allusion, which is dwelt upon in the eddy of this ver. 20, is not returned to until we reach ver. 21, which resumes the current of thought where we left it in ver. 19 at the words "the promise was made." Such a digression, for the purpose of lingering on a side aspect, naturally presenting itself to the loving memory of an "Hebrew of the Hebrews," is quite in the characteristic manner of Paul. And in the present case the digression has the life and power of true episode, really sustaining the meditation and reinvigorating the thought while apparently for the moment withdrawing the mind from the proper object of both.

21. *Is the law . . . forbid! Then: i.e.* since (ver. 19) its declared purpose is conviction of sin. *The promises:* for reason of the plural here, see note on ver. 16. *Of God:* this is not surplusage, but brings out the *awful* significance of the supposition that the law should be against the promises. (Hence) *God forbid:* see note on this expression in ii. 17.

For if . . . by the law: **if law had been given as that which gives life, then truly the righteousness would have been through the law.** The point of the statement here is made by *given*. The meaning of the first clause is not simply that the law of Moses could not give life, nor merely that no law whatever could conceivably accomplish this, but that the law as *given*, by the very manner in which it was given,—*e.g.* as pronouncing that curse (ver. 13), and as visibly doomed to abrogation,—contained evidence of not having been intended for that purpose, of procuring life to lost men. Correspondingly, the second clause means just what it says, "righteousness (the ground of justification) *would* no doubt have been through the law,"—*if* God had intimated that the law is fitted (and intended) to give life. *Life* here is, widely, **salvation (the inheritance)**, extending to and through eternity. The *righteousness* (justification *to life*) is indispensable in order to that. So that if law is to give life, it must begin with procuring *the righteousness*. The *for* bids us see here the justification of the preceding "God forbid!"

22. *But the Scripture . . . under sin. But:* strongly adversative = **so far from that.** *The Scripture:* (semi-personification) not the law, but **the law as "given,"** formal and express, in actual application to those who are under the law. *Hath concluded: concluded* here (as in Rom. xi. 32) is Latin (not English). The Greek word is that rendered *shut up* in ver. 23. The idea is, **enclosed**, with a certain **pressure or severity**, as in a narrow prison But the pronoun for *under* here, as also in vers. 10 and 23, is natively one of *motion*, so as to suggest the idea of our having been *driven* into the position of being *under* sin. Thus Homer speaks of cattle as being "under a cave," into which they have been driven (*Il.* iv. 279). *All* is neuter; but, according to a well-known use, is here employed for mankind **in the most general**

the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them
23 that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the
law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be
24 revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring*

sense. We thus see mankind, by the Scriptures, driven into a prison, where they are firmly secured under condemnation (Heb. ii. 15). This the Scripture does, as we see in Rom. i.–iii., by *proving* that God's law, so far from justifying any, condemns all,—most clearly those who have the light of positive revelation of law.

That the promise . . . believe: **that to believers the promise might be given by faith of Jesus Christ.** The Galatians knew that salvation is given to believers alone: the question was, whether it is received *by faith* alone, or faith without works. *The promise* here (as in ver. 14, see note) = **the thing promised**; and this expression, employed here, as above, to show that life is **a free gift** of God (corresponding to simply *faith* in man). *That:* **in order that.** This (see ver. 16, with notes) was the purpose of God, when (through the Scriptures) "concluding all under sin." So below:

23. *But before faith came.* The contrast implied in *but* here is suggested by the last word of ver. 22, *to believers* (it was foreordained to give the promise through faith). *Believers*, men **of faith**, thus represents the *characteristic* condition of God's people under the new dispensation. And correspondingly, *before faith came* (**before the advent of faith**), describes the *characteristic* condition of men under the old dispensation (see Introd. 39, 40).

Kept under the law. Kept: lit. **guarded**, as in a prison, by an armed watch. *Under the law:* cp. above note (ver. 22) on *under sin.* On the law's relation to sin here, see 1 Cor. xv. 56. But here, as in ver. 22, observe the *purpose* of God:

Shut up . . . revealed (corresponding to, *that the promise*, etc., in ver. 22). *Shut up:* see note on "concluded," ver. 22. *The faith:* here = **the religion** (of **faith**) (1 Tim. v. 8), **that way of life**, distinctively **faith.** *Which should be afterwards revealed:* **that was about to be fully manifested.** *Unto the faith:* this suggests another image—that of Israel, shut up by Pharaoh and his hosts, and by the very threat of imminent captivity or death *driven* into life and liberty by that wondrous way of the sea, on which God's people found salvation while their enemies found destruction.

24. *Wherefore the law . . . by faith. Wherefore:* **so that.** *Was:* **came to be.** *Schoolmaster:* the Greek word is **pedagogue**, and is not well translated *schoolmaster.* The **pedagogue** was a trusted servant (like Moses, Heb. iii. 5, 6), who had charge of the child, and might be his tutor, even in the sense of tutor in iv. 2 (see note). (*To bring us*) *to Christ:* better simply (without the *to bring us*), **for Christ:** as if, our **trainer for Christ.** The idea of a trusted servant leading a child to school is not admissible here; for it is not as a schoolmaster that Christ is here contemplated, but as the object of justifying faith:—*that we might be justified by faith.* The purpose of the law becomes thus manifested more and more fully as friendly at heart: though, as towards sin, law itself is always terrific in aspect and terrible in reality.

Was God sincere in (*by the law*) *threatening with death those whom He was resolved to justify unto life?*

25 *us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But
after that faith is come, we are no longer under a school-
master.
26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.
27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put

Is it consistent with God's holiness to do anything for the purpose of eliciting sinful disposition into sinful action?

It is said that "the Scripture" (in the singular) always refers to some particular passage or passages of Holy Writ: If it be so, what passage or passages has Paul in view in ver. 22? Can you find any case in which "the Scripture" means the whole Bible (i.e. *O. T.*)?

(6.) All Sons of God (25–29).

All are sons: hence "unity, equality, fraternity" in Christ.

Under a schoolmaster: lit. **under pedagogue, in a state of pupilage.** To be under a tutor (see iv. 2, with notes) is, even for a child, to be under a species of subjection incompatible with fully manifested sonship. Under even that species of subjection *we are no longer:* a sigh of relief from the last remains of bondage. *After that faith is come:* **the faith having come**: the dispensation of faith being come (see note on faith's coming in ver. 23). It is in *the dispensation* of faith that the emancipation reaches the community as a whole; but only when *he* believes, or faith comes in his heart, is the individual set free.

26. *For ye all . . . Jesus:* **For by faith in Christ Jesus ye all are sons of God.** The emphasis here is on *ye all* (are) *sons* (of God), and the main emphasis on *sons*. This is what is referred to by the *for:* "we are not under tutors, for we are sons." The word entering into the composition of pedagogue (*pais*) means only *child;* and the word for child in iv. 1 is lit. *infant*. But the word *son* in our text is the most powerful one for description of the filial relation,—that, *e.g.*, employed to describe the eternal sonship of Christ as God. Here it means the completed realization of the ideal of sonship, and that, sonship *to God*. The *ye all* means **all addressed by Paul**, whether Jewish or Gentile by birth, who are of the household of faith. *Through faith in Christ Jesus:* some would point it thus,—*through faith, in Christ Jesus*, as if the meaning had been, "Ye are sons through faith, (ye are sons) in Christ Jesus." But *faith in Christ* is a legitimate form of expression, with an intelligible meaning here; and the suggested change, by forcing too much into the clause, would so far weaken the emphasis on *all* are *sons of God*.

27. *For as many . . . put on Christ. For:* argument, "(ye are sons), for ye have put on Christ, and all who have put on Christ are sons." *As many:* **(such as:)** to show that *ye all* are sons.

Have put on Christ: **did put on Christ.** The expression means lit. **as one puts on a garment** (Matt. xxvii. 31), or **dons armour** (Eph. vi. 11). In Rom. xiii. 14, to "put on the Lord Jesus" must mean to assume moral character or habits like His (and which, according to Gal. ii. 20, really are His). But in the present text, where the question is about a son's attaining to legal majority, an exact analogue is found in a Roman youth's assumption of the *toga virilis* (though this *toga* did not imply completed majority, but

28 on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are

only inchoate majority). The idea of right, as constituted or represented by what one wears, is common among mankind. It is expressed in the Lord's own parable of the marriage garment (Matt. xxii. 11). To put on *a person*, so as to be legally in him, for right as well as adornment, is not a strained metaphor: when Phocion's wife was reproached for lack of ornament on her dress, she said, "Phocion is my ornament, who is now called the twentieth time to the command of the Athenian armies." (Plutarch: *Phocion.*) So Luther said of Christ, "I am Thy sin; Thou art my righteousness." Thus to put on Christ is to be (in right) a son of God; for He is a Son, the first-born of many brethren, although His peculiar sonship is by nature, and man's can be only by creation or by adoption: at least He has achieved completed emancipation from tutelage, by being "the end of the law for righteousness," to all believers.

Have been baptized: **were baptized.** (The English version may suggest that only some of those addressed by Paul had been baptized. No such suggestion is warranted by the Greek, which is consistent with the statement, "Ye, when baptized, put on Christ.") The **were baptized,** with **did put on Christ,** bids us look back and see what took place at the moment of baptism. *Into Christ:* manifestly a very deep expression, as if they had lost themselves in Him in order to be truly found in Him. It is not necessary to raise any question here about baptismal regeneration; for to reason upon the fact that the baptism which regenerates (Matt. iii. 11) is antecedent to faith, while the baptism received by adult converts (Acts xvi. 14, 15, and 31–34) is consequent upon faith, would be to go into a controversy not fairly raised by this text. Nor need we here raise any debate about the legitimacy of infant baptism. Paul is here speaking (see Introd. pp. 39–41) only of the normal case of an adult believer, and taking baptism as a symbol of the meaning of being in the faith. In that normal case the believer, in the act of receiving baptism, formally and solemnly declares his acceptance of Christ as Redeemer and King. And the man who has received Christ as Redeemer and King is in the condition not only of a "child" of God's house, but of a *son* of God, who has attained to completed emancipation from even the kindly tutorship of the law.

28. *There is neither Jew . . . Christ Jesus.* This is in detailed application of the grand principle, "Ye all are sons of God." The statement, along with the parallel passages (1 Cor. xii. 13; Col. iii. 11), would be a noble theme for an historical essay on "The Great Innovation" accomplished by the gospel in the social relations of mankind. It is only in our text that the statement is nearly complete. Here it occupies a place of unique interest, as illustrating at once the sigh of relief in ver. 25, and the jubilee trumpet blast in ver. 26. On this account, and on account of its intrinsic importance as showing the genius of evangelical religion through its fruits, we shall dwell for a little upon its contents.

In all the places what is set forth is the essential equality of believers in Christ. In 1 Cor. the equality is manifestly in respect of spiritual character or new nature. In our text it is more in keeping with the argument to regard the equality as (at least primarily) being in respect of legal standing in God's family. In Col. the words "barbarian," "Scythian," point to other distinctions besides those specified in our text. But in all the places what is meant

is, that *all such* distinctions are abolished in relation to spiritual standing, though not—witness, *e.g.*, the apostolic injunctions about relative duties (Eph. v. 22–vi. 9)—to the effect of subverting natural relations: these remain, but with a new spirit of light and love, constituting essential equality under circumstantial inequalities, and ever tending to do away with even the circumstantial inequalities so far as these are not inlaid in the very constitution of man as social.

For ye are all one in Christ Jesus. For: the reason why *there is neither Jew*, etc. *One* here is masculine, **one person** (Eph. ii. 15); in Col. iii. 11 the unity is by implication found in Christ; while in 1 Cor. xii. 13 we have expressly, "we are all baptized into *one* **body**"—which body (ver. 12) is Christ's. The *ye* in our text is linguistically emphatic, and so is the *ye* in the following ver. (29), as if = "you *Galatian* believers;" but the contrast of Jew to Gentile is not required by the thought in ver. 29, and is excluded by the thought in our text.

There is . . . female. There is neither . . . nor. The verb here is rare. The force of it is, **There is not in existence Jew nor, etc., there is no longer any such thing as Jew or.** When we come to *male* and *female*, the Greek form of expression is changed. It is not, *there is neither male nor female*, but, **there is not** (any longer in existence) **male and female.** It has been supposed that the change of expression is occasioned by a difference in the nature of the things:—the relation of the sexes being natural and permanent, while the relations of Jew to Greek and of bond to free are conventional and evanescent.

Neither Jew nor Greek. See note on *Jew* in ii. 14. *Greek* here (as in Rom. i. 16, cp. with Luke xxiv. 47) manifestly stands for the **Gentile** world; so that the clause includes all mankind in its two great divisions from the viewpoint of *religion*. That circumstantial differences were to be retained and respected, Paul shows incidentally in such passages as Rom. ix. 1–5, xi. 1–15. But the essential oneness is clearly set forth—*e.g.* in respect of primitive origin (Acts xvii. 26); in respect of ruin by sin in the first Adam (Rom. iii. 5, v. 12–14); and in respect of spiritual standing and character through faith (Rom. i. 16, 17, as well as in this text and the parallel passages already referred to). Many believe that a reconstructed Jewish nation in Palestine, with a special function in Christendom, is in the plan of God relatively to our world's future. At present converted Jews tend to assume, without effort, the nationality of the people among whom their lot is cast.

Neither bond nor free. The word for *bond* here is the common Greek word for **servant.** But its contrast with *free* shows that here at least it means **slave.** And, in fact, the contrast is not needed for this definition. *Servant* would be understood as ordinarily meaning **slave** by all readers of Paul's Epistles. Thus in iv. 1, 2 (see notes). Thus in Eph. vi. 5, where he is speaking of the servant class as a whole, but is shown to mean (generally) slave by the statement in ver. 8 (and perhaps by the word, lit. *lord*, which he employs, vers. 5, 9, to describe the master class). It is implied in 1 Tim. vi. 1 that there may have been free servants here and there, as there may have been in the slaveholding states of North America. But in those states, free service being the rare exception, the word "servant" ordinarily meant "slave." So in the "civilised" world as first addressed by the gospel. One needs to know the extent to which slavery prevailed, and the misery as well as degradation it involved, in order to appreciate the vastness of the change involved in the declaration, "there is neither bond nor free." The formal relation of master

to slave was not declared simply untenable. But the spiritual equality and fraternity attained in Christ effected an instant amelioration of the slave's inward condition and of the master's disposition towards him; while the spiritual maturity of his manhood in Christ made bond-service unnatural and emancipation inevitable. Paul's Epistle to Philemon is a most beautiful illustration of the peaceful, beneficent revolution in process. But in all Christian communities the process takes place—the spring sun shining, and the frosty chains of winter melting away before the spring.

There is neither male nor female: see above for the change in form of expression. Except among the noble "barbarians" of Germany (Tacitus, *Germania*), the spiritual equality of male to female was not recognised by representative Gentile nations at this time. The Romans showed this even in their boast (Suetonius, *The Twelve Cæsars*, preface) of superiority to the Greeks in this respect, that a Roman was not ashamed to allow the women of his family to appear at a supper party (corresponding to our dinner party). Among the Greeks, at least after the heroic age, the position of woman was one of marked inferiority, of the same nature with that of women at present under the zenana system: the case of Phocion's wife, like that of Hypatia, is an exception to the rule, that a woman was notable only when she had lost woman's crown. Among polygamic communities recognised spiritual equality of the sexes was, and is, of course, impossible. The formal process through which polygamy was extirpated by the gospel cannot be clearly traced. But (see Paul's notes on relative duties of husbands and wives, and his separate advices and injunctions to widows and maids, and women as a class) the fact of essential spiritual equality was uniformly proceeded upon as axiomatic and fundamental; and this was the real process: as in the case of bond-service, so here, the fact, fairly embraced, would of itself work off all that is incompatible with it, and thus accomplish all needful reforms in circumstantials.

One in Christ Jesus. On *one*, see above. *In Christ Jesus.* This does not imply that there is not a community of nature by creation. Rather it assumes that community of nature as now restored, or realized, through redemption. "It was not for Jew, nor for freeman, nor for male, distinctively, that Christ died; but for *human being*, existing equally in Gentile, in bondsman, in female. It is not anything peculiar to any one class, but the *human nature* that is common to all, that is clothed with His righteousness, and quickened, and purified, and exalted by His Spirit." As *in Christ Jesus* here manifestly means (see note on "faith's coming" in ver. 23) under the new dispensation as contrasted with the old, I here make a note, relatively to the distinctions referred to in our text, on the state of things under the old dispensation.

It illustrates with curious felicity the apostle's general position (iv. 1–7) that the state of God's people in the past time was one of comparative immaturity and pupilage. Thus, 1. as to *religion*:—The unity of mankind, set forth in their own Scriptures (Gen. i.–x.), was involved in the fundamental promise of blessing (*to all nations*) in Abraham and his seed, and obtained practical recognition in the occasional adoption of aliens into the commonwealth of Israel, while prophecy sang exulting about a complete realization of that unity as a distinguishing glory of the Messianic kingdom of the future. But there was a "middle wall of partition," not only in respect of divine institution for temporary purposes, but also in respect of affection in the hearts of His people: while the carnal-minded Jew really hated the heathens, even spiritual-minded Jews—witness this Epistle—required to be educated into catholicity of affec-

tion, even in the form of "love to the brotherhood," giving effective response to the principle, "Ye all are sons of God." 2. As to *servants*. In the patriarchal age, bond-service, though natural, could hardly be cruel beyond measure. The master was vitally dependent on the good-will of his servants. The 318 servants of Abraham, who could handle sword and spear, were his defensive army, and could easily kill him, or leave him (helpless), if they would. But in the settled condition of Canaan the "domestic institution" was recognised and provided for by divine law. No doubt in various ways free service was owned and encouraged as the more honourable and desirable: witness the statutory provisions for equitable and compulsory emancipation. The bond-servant, too,—witness the injunction that *he* should eat the passover along with the master's family, while the free servant ate apart along with his own family,—was made, though lower than a son, a veritable member of the family in its highest relations, in a condition essentially different from that of a drove of "field hands" in a cotton plantation. In Israel's history we find no trace of that miserable degradation of the class of bond-servants which characterised their condition in heathen lands. But in the new dispensation there is a sensible advance even in this respect; so that in a maturely developed Christian community the existence of such a state of things as is implied in O. T. legislation about this matter is almost inconceivable. 3. As to *woman*. Besides being formally recognised as the spiritual equal of man, she had from the outset an honourable place in the household, which was never lost. When specially gifted, she could rise to highest honour and power in the nation. But the polygamy of Orientalism was not prohibited by express law; but only regulated, and in various ways branded as only a tolerated evil, so that it seems to have completely disappeared long before the coming of Messiah. That abomination, indeed, would not but wither away in a community with Israel's religious principles and life. Still, on the whole, the normal position of woman under the new dispensation is sensibly higher than her normal position under the old.

[*Barbarian, Scythian*. Col. iii. 11. To complete the view of "the great innovation," I add a supplementary note on the distinctions represented by these words. *Scythian* may be taken for heathen in the sense of **heath-folk**: those who live out on the waste common, like tribes of wandering gipsies. Even they by the gospel are brought into the spiritual brotherhood and unity of Christendom: witness, within the last few years, the process in the case of the Santhals of India. *Barbarian*, by use and wont, has reference to **culture**. The Greeks, by this word, meant **outsiders**,—all who are not Greeks,—thus exhibiting the really barbarous conceit of Chinese. Then, as in respect of culture a distinctness from mankind in general was claimed for themselves by the conceited nation of the Greeks, so in the same respect a distinctness from commonplace Greeks was claimed by the conceited caste of the "philosophers," or literary class. This cruel pride of caste on the score of "culture" is not uncommon on the part of the literary class in Christian nations: even in the act of deriding uncultured human beings as "Philistines," they exhibit a veritable Philistinism in themselves, insulting that manhood which is the only thing great on earth, blaspheming that human nature which is worn by God. The "scribes," the theologically cultured class, among the Jews, could speak of commonplace members even of the "royal priesthood" with a truly theological energy of depreciation: "this people, which knoweth not the law, is cursed." But among the Greeks the disposition thus widely prevalent was peculiarly rampant. In a national council, when the question was, whether

29 all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

they should go to war with the Romans, one orator said that the question was only of expediency, that regarding principle there could be no question, because the Romans were "barbarians," and all "barbarians" were natural enemies to the Greeks. No English word can express the energy of contemptuous loathing with which the word *banausoi*—employed to describe all who are not "philosophers"—so often came from the "honeyed" lips of Plato "the divine." All that is at an end in so far as individuals and communities are really influenced by the gospel, with its glorious principle, "Ye all are sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ."]

29. *And if ye be Christ's . . . promise.* This brings us back, after what has been reckoned one of the grandest passages in all Paul's Epistles, to the starting-point at ver. 7 (see notes there), "*And if ye be*": and since ye are. *Christ's:* refers back to *in Christ* in ver. 28; and may mean, not simply, of His people, but, of His body. *Abraham's seed,* see ver. 16, with notes. Christians are here made identical with "the seed, who is Christ." There is a sort of physical identity involved in their "mystical union" with Him as being His body; but legal identity is what is immediately in view here. *Heirs according to promise:* for note on *inheritance* see under ver. 17: and for notes on *promise* see under vers. 16, 18. *Promise* still keeps in view here the freedom and sovereignty of grace in our salvation, but the emphasis here is on *heirs*: "if *Christ's,* then *the seed,* and (*so*) *heirs*" (Rom. viii. 17).

Give theological proofs of the unity of mankind: one from the Christian doctrine of sin, and one from the Christian doctrine of redemption.

State of woman in Palestine at the coming of Christ. 1. *Illustrate her comparatively high condition from the history of His birth, His dedication, and His sustentation.* 2. *Give a sentence of His showing the theological reason for her exaltation.* 3. *Give a sentence spoken to Him indicating her consciousness of remaining degradation.*

The religious distinction: refer to cases in Christ's ministry illustrative, 1. *Of the then remaining separation (on principle); 2. Of the then beginning termination (on principle and in effect) of the existence of that separation.*

Slavery among the heathens: 1. *Condition,—what of the Helots?* 2. *Number,—what was the proportion of bond to free in the Athenian republic?* 3. *Influence on public safety,—illustrate from the servile wars of Rome.*

CHAPTER IV.

1 NOW I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth

(7.) The Heir de Jure and de Facto (iv. 1–7).

After description of the minor's condition, we have an account of the process through which majority is reached, in Christ by the Spirit.

1–7. *Now . . . Christ.* This section raises various questions, affecting the construction of details, which depend on our view of the whole. 1. Is Paul, in

2 nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the

his description of the minor, taking into view the (pre-Christian) heathen world as well as church? 2. In his representation, is the father alive, or is he dead? 3. In speaking of the relation of sonship to inheritance, does he proceed on the Hebrew law, or on the Roman? My answer to these questions is determined by my view of the main purpose of the passage, and by the consideration that, beyond accomplishing that main purpose, Paul has no interest in laborious scrupulosity about details. 1. He speaks of the typical case of believers under the Old Testament, but may glance at something similar in the condition of the heathen world before Christ. 2. The second question is never once before his mind: his only interest is in bringing out fully what he has in his mind regarding the son and heir (*he is speaking of*). 3. In point of fact his statement corresponds to the Roman law, not to the Hebrew; but there is no good reason to believe that he is alluding to any formal code, to anything beyond natural principles which suggest and explain themselves when he is speaking. (The suggestion of a special *Galatian* code or law in his view seems extremely far-fetched.)

1–2. Description of a minor's condition separately from Paul's doctrine.

1. *Now I say* (in relation to the sonship and heirship I have been speaking of): **Here is a piece of my mind about that matter:—**

The heir, here described as *a child*, is in ver. 7 plainly spoken of as coming to be only through attainment of maturity. The heir by right is such from birth, but the heir in state and enjoyment is such only (ver. 4) when the proper time has come.

As long as (*he is*) *a child:* **over all the time he is an infant.** Infancy here, as in our civil law, extends over the whole period of pupilage.

Differeth nothing . . . lord of all. Lord of all, in destiny and right. *Servant* (see note on *bond* in iii. 28) here, as appears from ver. 2, is **bond servant.** We have seen that under the Old Testament the bond-servant had this in common with a son, that he was a recognised member of the family. We now see that the son has this in common with a slave, that he is under subjection exclusive of personal freedom. No doubt, in relation even to that subjection, there is this difference, that in the son's case it is naturally evanescent, while in the slave's it is not: in the son's it is but as the egg-shell in which the immature life is cherished for liberation, in the slave's it is a prison wall enclosing a mature life. But as in the slave's case, so in the "infant" heir's, subjection exclusive of personal freedom is an essential condition of the life.

But . . . governors. But = **on the contrary** (he). *Under:* here, too, as in iii. 22 (see note), an accusative of motion, as if = "*placed* beneath." *Tutors and governors:* **guardians and stewards.** The plural, to indicate the *general* conditions of minority. The **tutor** here is supposed to have a general charge, especially over **the person**: the "tutor" of old Scottish practice, who drew the rents *for himself* during his ward's minority, will serve to illustrate what Paul means by the condition of an infant *lord of all*. The **steward** is an upper servant, with special charge over **the property**: see a fine sample in the case of Eliezer of Damascus (Gen. xv. 1–4, and xxiv.), a sample which may have been in Paul's view when writing iii. 6, 7 (and recollecting Gen. xv. 1–4).

3 father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage

Until the time appointed of the father: **until the (day) previously fixed by the father.** The word for *time appointed* was in classic Greek employed to describe "**a day fixed** for anything,"—*e.g.* **a limited period** within which money was to be paid, or actions brought. *The father* (see introductory note on this section) here means simply the superior, who has power to fix the time of majority. The time in most civilized lands is fixed by statute law; though even in such cases a father may have some discretion within the limits of the statute. Again, infancy may by law be outgrown, and majority attained, through a succession of stages: thus under the Roman law the *toga virilis*, symbolizing majority and freedom in some respects, was assumed at 17; while the "senatorial age," of qualification for legislative office, was not reached until well on in life otherwise held completely mature. But these details are irrelevant here.

3. *Even so we . . . world. We:* observe the change of person here from the *ye* of iii. 29. Does this imply that Paul is about to speak of *Jewish* Christians only? Not necessarily. He has, so to speak, by his argument in iii. 7–29, adopted the Gentile Christians into the "one" family of God, so that the past history of the church is now theirs as well as his: this is part of the "inheritance" to which they have been admitted by grace. *When we were children* (**infants**). (See introductory note on this section.) The word **infants** alone is not conclusive for the view, that it is the condition of the church, not the world (before Christ), he is describing; for the word of itself refers only to **immaturity** of religious condition, such as certainly existed in the case of heathens who were religious. But the *even so* makes *this* **infant** to be "lord of all;" and the whole representation assumes the continued legal and spiritual oneness of the person. *Were in bondage under*, etc. Some would have it thus,—*were in bondage, under*, etc., or, *were under*, etc., *being in bondage.* **Our version seems best.**

The elements of the world. Much fanciful interpretation has been practised here; and there is considerable room for reasonable difference of opinion, especially in connection with the question, whether *the world* does not necessarily imply that Paul is speaking of **heathenism**, or something over and above the condition of the pre-Christian church.

The world does not need to be taken in a bad sense. The strain of the passage requires only a sense like that given to "flesh" in the expressions,—relatively to the divinely ordained condition of the O. T. church,—"carnal commandment" (Heb. vii. 16), and "carnal ordinances" (Heb. ix. 10). The "carnal" in these expressions refers not to any impurity in the things thus described, but only to their outwardliness and consequent evanescence, as adapted only to a childish condition of the church, in contrast to the spirituality and consequent permanence of their antitypes or analogues in the new dispensation. So here, *of the world*—in relation to the same system of "commandments" and "ordinances"—may (cp. 1 John ii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 24, 25) refer simply to evanescence arising out of babyish externalism, as contrasted with the analogous things of the new dispensation, in which (1 Cor. xiii. 11) the believer is a grown man, who casts away childish things (lit. "the things of infancy"). See next note.

The elements. The word has primary reference to the letters of the alphabet, regarded as going to the constitution of a word or sentence. In 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, it means the constitutive materials of the physical world, whose particles in

4 under the elements of the world: But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a

combination constitute a system. In Col. ii. 8, 20 (*margin*), it means constitutive materials of a knowledge which is "worldly" in the sense of being attainable without supernatural revelation. In Heb. v. 12, the *elements*—in our version "first principles"—are still the constitutive materials of a system of knowledge, though the knowledge is given to us through positive revelation, "the oracles of God." In our text, and in the following context, ver. 9, they are (see preceding note) *worldly* in a different sense from that in Col. ii.; and, like the A B C of Heb. v., they are (ver. 9) "weak and beggarly" as compared with completed system of knowledge in a mature mind.

Were in bondage under, etc. *Under* here, too, has accusative of motion. From the view of the *elements* given above, we can understand how they constitute a state of bondage natural to a child (vers. 1, 2), but unnatural and intolerable to a grown man, whom their discipline may have served to educate into freedom. Through the child's toiling at letters and syllables the man is trained to read without consciousness of spelling. Through a similar slavishness of toiling at "elements," a musician learns to play complicated compositions on a difficult instrument as freely and easily as a bird sings. But this comparative emancipation gives emphasis of contrast to the bondage implied in the preceding condition, a bondage arising out of the circumstances of the condition, not from the mere will of "tutors and governors." In the *spiritual* life, the "worldly" or "carnal" ordinances, which are appropriate only to the childhood of the church, often appear to be tolerable, attractive, even fascinating, to Christians in the dispensation of maturity. That is, Christians may lapse into a condition of second childhood. (1 Cor. iii. 1–3; Heb. v. 12, 13.)

4. *But . . . was come* (cp. ver. 2, *the time appointed of the father*). The word for "times" in Eph. i. 10, "fulness of the times," means **seasons**, or **appropriate times**. The word in our text means simply *time*, protensive quantity, duration. The significance thus is to be sought in *fulness*. A good illustration of the meaning is high-water (for which some Scottish Galatians have a noble word, *flon*, lit. fulness). Here a good enough paraphrase is, **completion** of the time. This may mean either the arrival of the *date* as fixed by divine decree, or the attainment of that *state*, of the church or the world, or both, which constituted ripeness or readiness for Emmanuel's coming and work. In relation to what goes before, it is most likely that what the apostle has (at least immediately) in view is, preparation of the church, through her having outgrown the conditions of her childhood so as to feel them an irksome bondage, and also having become fully convinced of sin: we know that simultaneously there had been going on another sort of preparation of mankind as a race, so that "the world was waiting when Christ appeared."

God sent forth his Son: lit. **sent forth from (Himself) His Son.** This implies the pre-existence of Christ, and naturally suggests His Godhead, as one who is *the* Son of God by nature, by eternal generation (see note on ii. 20). Observe another *sending forth* in ver. 6. So that in this section we have the Three Persons of the adorable Trinity engaged in the redemption of lost man (2 Cor. xiii. 14). *God:* This name (*ibid.*) is frequently appropriated to the First Person; because, say theologians, He is the *pēgē theotētos*, the fontal Person of the Godhead, of whom the Son is begotten, and from whom

5 woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

the Spirit proceeds. Accordingly, under this name **the Father** is here described as *sending forth* (His Son). The word for *sending forth* is a verb to which **apostle** (Heb. iii. 1) is corresponding noun; Christ being sent forth to "expound" the Father (John i. 18), as the Twelve were sent forth to expound Christ (Eph. iii. 8). The designation *Son* is specially appropriate here on account of the purpose of His mission as here described,—the achievement of **sonship for lost men.**

Made of . . . the law: better, **born of woman, born under law.** The word for *made* is lit. **become**, or **come to be.** But the expression for *made of* (any one) often occurs for simply being **born** (of any one); and **born** *under law*, thus apparently demanded, is more vividly and incisively to Paul's purpose here than the more vague (and not unambiguous) *made.*

Made of a woman. Some seek materials here for theologizing about the Incarnation beyond the simple fact of being **born.** In truth, there are no materials. We know that Mary was to Christ what (excepting sin) any other mother is to her son. But here we are informed only that, in the ordinary sense of the term, he was **born of woman**—as any ordinary man is.

Made under the law. Made misses the point of the statement. He was **born** under law: "in or at His very birth He was not only of woman, but under law." *Under the law*, instead of **under law,** not only is unwarranted by the Greek, but is fitted to countenance the mistaken impression that Christ was, so to speak, merely a *born Jew;* that His subjection to law by birth had reference only to the law under which the Jews were placed by positive revelation, not to the law under which all men are by nature. This would make the *redemption* spoken of here, if not His redeeming office and work as such, to refer primarily and properly only to the O. T. church. Some accept this consequence. We regard it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of their construction of *law* here (see on "Law" in Introd. p. 42). At or by His birth He was under the whole burden of law which has to be borne for man's redemption and adoption, of which law the O. T. revelation had made a full **declaration.**

5. *To redeem . . . sons:* **in order that he might redeem those under law, in order that** we might **receive the adoption (of sons).** Our version obscures the fact that the two clauses are co-ordinate in so far as they alike set forth *the purpose* of what is set forth in ver. 4. Some think that the *redeeming* here ought to be specially connected with the latter part of that verse, and that the *receiving* here ought to be specially connected with the former part. It is extremely doubtful whether any such nice correspondence, of part to part, was in the view of Paul. It is best to regard our text as simply setting forth **a composite purpose** of the composite action set forth in ver. 4.

To redeem . . . law. (Them that were) *under the law:* for a good reason why this should be rendered **under law,** see note on ver. 4. *To redeem* is here, **to buy out** of their bondage. But (see note on ver. 4) the bondage is not merely that of children of God under the yoke of Mosaism, but also and especially that of sinners **under the curse.**

That we . . . adoption of sons. Adoption (lit. **son-making**)=**sonship by grace** (not of nature). Some have made the *receive* to mean, **getting back.** But that would exclude *the adoption* in its distinctive nature, as a thing resulting from free grace of God. What we *get back* is sonship; adoption we

6 And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of

do not get back—we simply *receive* it. The *receiving* in our text is from (God). To *receive the adoption* = **obtaining what is meant by God's promising to make sinful enemies into sons**, whether in law or in fact. (*Of sons* in our version is not superfluous; for there may be *adoption* into other relations than that of sonship: the Greek word is unambiguous.)

6. *And because . . . Father.* Mark the connection here in vers. 4, 5, 6: "His *Son*," "the adoption of *sons*," "because ye are *sons*." As compared with incarnation, the result of what may be called a physical process (assumption of manhood), "adoption" here is the result of a process distinctively legal or judicial (instatement in full possession of privileges). Hence the logic of "*because* ye are sons:" "because through adoption you have the legal standing or position of sons, therefore God has provided for giving you a corresponding disposition or character." Thus what He has sent is not only in general *the Spirit* (iii. 2), but in especial *the Spirit of His Son*.

God hath . . . Son. For *sent forth*, see above note under ver. 4. *The Spirit* **of His Son** is most fully explained by the dogma of the *filioque*, that the Third Person of the Godhead "proceeds" from the Second as well as from the First (John xvi. 7). But (*ibid.* 8–15) "the Spirit of Christ," beyond that promanation which takes place by necessity of divine nature, has, like Christ Himself, a special mission in relation to redemption ("Mission of The Comforter"—"Paraclete").

Into your hearts: of greater textual authority is **our**. The frequent change of persons, "you" and "we," is noticeable in this part of the Epistle as an indication of vehemently exercised mind and heart; but the precise cause of the changes in every case may not be easily ascertainable: let the reader *try* to account for them by putting himself inside of Paul's mind and heart. *Into our hearts* goes beyond the Spirit's work in outward revelation through inspiration of teachers (2 Pet. i. 21), and beyond miraculous attestation of their teaching (Heb. ii. 4). It extends to **inward illumination**—not, however, of all men, but of "us," those who "are sons;" so that this work of the Spirit is an evidence of sonship (Rom. viii. 14), as that described in iii. 5 is an attestation of truthfulness in teaching. The *heart* in Scripture is generally **the mind**, but specially the mind **as seat of affections**. Here it is significant that it is *into the heart* that the Spirit is sent (cp. John v. 40 with John v. 42 and Matt. v. 8). In order even to effective illumination, the Comforter must begin with regeneration and purification (1 Cor. ii. 9, 10).

Crying here = uttering **a "strong cry."** The Greek for *crying* is neuter, because there is no special cause for emphasizing the personality of the Spirit (cp. John xvi. 7–15, where, in vers. 13, 14, the Spirit is made masculine, and very strongly emphasized as such, "HE shall glorify me"). The point here is the influence upon believers of His being sent into their hearts. But here it is *the Spirit* that is represented as *crying* (cp. Rom. viii. 15, where it is believers that are represented as—through the Spirit—uttering the same cry). *The Spirit's* crying in God's sons is pathetically set forth in Rom. viii. 26: that advocate ("Paraclete") giving them their prayers whenever their heart confesses a wish toward the Father, though it should be only as with a babe's inarticulate moaning. *His* crying in their hearts is vitally connected with Christ's living in them (ii. 20), and even with Christ's pleading for them (1 John ii. 2—"Paraclete").

Abba, Father: **Abba the Father.** This expression occurs elsewhere only

7 his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore
thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an
heir of God through Christ.
8 Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto

in Rom. viii. 15 and Mark xiv. 36 (see this last place). *Abba* is simply the Chaldee for *Father*. It has been thought that, through long familiarity, *Abba* had come to be regarded or felt as a sort of **proper name** of God. The early use of it curiously illustrates what Paul has been saying (iii. 28) of the unity resulting from the gospel: for *Abba Father* unites Hebrew and Greek on one lip, making the petitioner at once a Jew and a Gentile. The detailed explanations of the origin of this compound expression, though laudable in their intention to save a spiritual ejaculatory prayer (uttered in the awful circumstances of Mark xiv. 36) from the appearance of involving "vain repetition," are in point of reason quite unsatisfactory: we do not know how the expression originated,—we do know that it was uttered by the Son of God in His agony.

7. *Wherefore . . . through Christ.* *Wherefore* is simply wrong; the right rendering is, **so that** (or **and so**?) *Thou:* again a change of person, Greatheart now, in his tender urgency, bringing the glorious truth home to **the individual** believer who reads his letter. (In Galatia many individuals will say here, "Ah! he's thinking of *me*,—looking at me with those eyes of his.") *Heir* here, as compared with *heir* in ver. 1, see note on ver. 1. *Through Christ:* the correct reading is, **through God** (a harsh expression, and therefore the more likely to have been the true original text). The sentence runs: **So that thou art no longer slave, but son; while if son, then heir through God.** The harsh expression, **through God**, is not here unduly strong. Observe (note on *God* in ver. 4) that the sonship comes to us from the Three Persons of the Godhead, so that Christians are sons "by creation of God **Almighty**" (R. Burns).

The Spirit crying, Abba, Father: What is there here in common with some cases of demoniacal possession?

Is it in all cases a sin to have a slave? Give scriptural reasons for your opinion.

What great division or "schism" is connected with "filioque?"

If it be true that we must have the Spirit (as cause of faith) before we can receive the adoption, how can it be true that it is because we are sons that God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts?

Give, from Scripture, a view of another sort of son-making besides that set forth above.

Degeneracy towards childish externalism: Give examples in relation to public worship.

(8.) The Major going back into Infancy (8–11).

"Fears of Paul"—that this church, which has known God because God has known her, is relapsing into the old position of heathenism and Judaism.

8, 9. *Howbeit . . . bondage?* The word for *howbeit* here means, **but**, very strongly adversative: = "Alas, how far from your privileges is your practice!" There is a pathetic appeal implied in the **contrast** of *then* (**yon time**) **in** ver. 8 and *now* in ver. 9.

9 them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye

8. *Then . . . gods.* The root word for *service* here is that for *bondage* in ver. 9, and that commented on in the note on "bond," under iii. 28. On account of this word, the text has been drawn into the controversy about *dulia* and *latria* (worship of creatures and worship of God). In the present connection the word means simply, that the Galatian worship of false gods was a **bondage**, a **slavish service** (*disparaging* use of the word).

Them which . . . gods. By nature: the word here is the same as in ii. 15 (see note), but the meaning is different. Here the meaning is, **in reality** ("in the nature of things"). Instead of *by nature are not gods*, the best reading is, **gods which are not really (such)**, (or **do not exist**). It is not in the manner of Paul, nor of Scripture, to deny the existence of supernatural demons (worshipped by the heathens as gods). The point of Scripture is made (1 Cor. x. 20) by saying, that those demons are *not gods* (really). Paul here refers back to the **heathenish** condition of the Galatians. His reference thus at first sight suggests the conclusion, that all along, from the beginning of chap. iv., he has been dealing with the pre-Christian condition of Gentiles as well as Jews. But see introductory note to sec. 7, and the following notes. What here takes place is a sort of rhetorical adoption of Gentiles into the *inheritance* of Jewish tradition.

When ye knew not God: **not knowing God** (past tense). The expression here warrants the paraphrase, "*because* you did not know *God*," etc. It suggests a sort of palliation of the guilt of their idolatry in yonder past time. The argument in Rom. i. 19, etc., starts from a different point of view. There the apostle's purpose is to show that the heathen were "without excuse," and therefore what he says is, that they had means of knowing God, and even some sort of knowledge of God. But here, his purpose being (partly) to allude to their comparative excusableness, what he says is, that they had **no real knowledge** of God. How this bears upon the question of the competency of natural theology the reader may take into consideration—the text does not declare. *God . . . gods: God* here manifestly means, **the true God**, (what is) **really God**; and *gods* means, "gods," in inverted commas, = **those who passed for gods** among the heathens.

9. *But now . . . bondage?* See above note on *now* and *then* in ver. 8. The Greek binds the two together strictly by sheer force of grammar. What is here brought forward is woful contrast.

After ye have known, etc.: **having known, ye who once knew.** The word for *known* here is stronger than that for *known* in ver. 8. It is at least a fair question, suggested by the dictionary, whether by *know* in ver. 8 Paul does not mean, vaguely, "having any sort of **knowledge of** God's being and attributes;" while by *know* in ver. 9 he means, "having **personal acquaintance** with God, or some real insight into His being and attributes." But the question does not really rise out of our text. The contrast which the text marks (between *then* and *now*) is apparently completed when we think of **knowing** (in any sense) as against **not knowing**. (*Knowledge*, in every real sense, is infinitely important.) Observe *known God*. He does not say, "Jehovah," the redeeming God of Israel, but simply *God*. It is difficult for us to think that the heathens do not really know *God* (see Acts xvii. 23).

Or rather . . . of God: = **I ought rather to have said.** *Of* here is by.

again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye
10 desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and

Are known of God means that **the knowing began with God.** The *knowledge* here cannot mean mere vision of them; for in the sense of mere vision God's knowledge extends to all things in the universe equally. It is *such* a knowledge on His part, including personal affection towards them (see Ps. i. 6), as has resulted in their coming to know Him (ver. 6; so in John xiv. 22, 23): like *the sun's* gaze, which creates where it looks. *Our* knowing Him shows that *He* has thus known us. **Are (by Him) made to know** would suit the context, but would be a violence to the Greek here.

The weak and beggarly elements. On *elements*, see note under ver. 3. *Weak* is contrasted with **power** (as to effects), and *beggarly* with **affluence** (in respect of gifts). The contrasted strength and riches are seen in the appropriate food of grown men (Heb. v. 12). The disparaging expression is here applied, not to the ritualistic externalism of heathen religions, but rather to that God-given system of ritualistic ordinances which had served for the church in her infancy: that which is appropriate food for a babe or sick man is feeble and poor for a grown man in full health.

How turn ye back again: **How comes it that ye are turning back anew?** The **anew** means that they are making **a new beginning** in religion, just as if they had never known the way of faith in Christ (see below, v. 4, with note); in effect, lapsing from Christianity just in as far as they embrace legalism. Thus far, in their case, legalism was coincident with idolatry:—*e.g.* their Judaism had in it an element of "will-worshipping" superstition, equivalent to apostasy from the true God, in making that to be matter of religion which He had "made old" (Heb. viii. 13). See note on "ye observe" in ver. 10.

Whereunto . . . bondage? Desire = **will** ("ye *will* be in bondage"). Theirs was a **slavish hankering** for "childish things," the love of which, natural in a babe, is revolting in a grown man. Whence this degeneracy? (See 2 Cor. iii. 14–18, and iv. 3, 4.)

10. *Ye observe . . . years.* In point of grammar the rendering might have been, **Do ye observe . . . years?** But the rhetoric of the passage is against this rendering, which, however, would not really affect the meaning in substance. The word for *observe* here has in it a preposition, which has the effect of (*observe*) **closely, carefully, laboriously.** *Months* here is lit. **moons, lunar months.** *Times* (see above note on *time* in ver. 4) is lit. **seasons**; probably with the same special meaning as in Acts xiv. 17, where "fruitful seasons" manifestly means "seasons of the year." Paul's whole description here means, **all sorts of festivals connected with time**; for *days* refers, no doubt (among other things, or only), to **the week.** The sentence, in view of what has gone before, may be reasonably regarded as having reference to the distinctively Jewish system of church festivals. There has been some discussion of the question, What precisely, in that Jewish system, corresponds to the "days," "months," "seasons," and "years," here, respectively? It is not clear that Paul himself had this question in view. His point here is only, that **that sort of thing**, the antiquated Jewish festival system, is observed, sedulously and scrupulously, by the Galatians. The suggestion that, at the moment when he was writing, they were in the act of keeping some festival, —say a Sabbatical year,—and that from this we may get help towards ascertaining the date of the Epistle, ought not to have been made by men

11 months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.

bound to exercise plain good sense in the interpretation of Scripture: it is a mere guess, in no way warranted by the present tense of *ye observe*, as if that had meant, **you are in the act of observing.**

Ye observe has a far deeper meaning = **you make a religion of the observance.** Paul points to the observance as showing, by way of illustrative sample, that the Galatians are lapsing, bent upon lapsing, into the childish, and consequently now slavish, conditions described in vers. 1, 2, 3, 9. Their observance deserves to be thus branded:—1. Because it implies that they do not take God's express will as the only rule of their religious practice. 2. Because they proceed on the view that there is holiness in mere stated times, as if the observance of these could confer saving benefit—*ex opere operato*—through the mere form of observing, apart from faith and love in the observer, reliance on God alone and obedience to His declared will; and thus 3. because in their practice they are actuated by a belief opposed to the "faith" of the gospel,—belief that by outward conformity to "law" (*not God's* in this case) man can achieve some righteousness of his own for justification before God. With **the Sabbath Question** this text has nothing to do: the most vehement Sabbatarian can fully concur with Paul in the view, that to make a religion of church festivals is (so far) to apostatize from Christianity.

11. *I am afraid . . . in vain.* *Afraid* (see note on *fearing* in ii. 12): **in relation to you I am in fear.** *Bestowed on you labour* is here a really happy translation: lit. **laboured to (wards) you.** *Lest I have* is not good English, and the original is somewhat unusual Greek; but the rhetorical effect of **the indicative mood** here, coming after *lest*, is to show that Paul is looking upon the possible result as being realized in fact. The word for *in vain* here is the same as in iii. 4, not as in ii. 2, 21. (See those places, with the notes.) Here it makes Paul to mean, "lest you have put a fool's cap on my labours." He thus fears that by their foolish practice, of babyish ritualism, they are bringing ruinous disgrace upon the Christian religion.

As to religious observances connected with time:—1. *Find something in the God-given O. T. system representing respectively "days," "moons," "seasons," and "years." 2. What are the (alleged) scriptural reasons for regarding the Sabbath Law as distinct in nature from the evanescent portions of that system?*

As to ritualism: 1. *How does it tend to infidelity in the new dispensation? 2. Why did it not tend to infidelity in the old dispensation?*

As to knowledge of God: 1. *How can heathens both know God and not know Him? 2. What were the specialties of Galatian or Celtic demonolatry? 3. What of the suggestion, that the heathen world has been given over to malignant demons?*

As to the doctrine of the church: 1. *If Paul denounced as lapsing from the faith the Galatians whom he addresses as "brethren," "churches," are Protestants entitled, because they regard the Romish system as anti-Christian, to regard the Romish communion as not a branch of the Christian church? 2. On what ground can a man who owns a pure-living Romanist as a Christian, refuse to own as a Christian a pure-living Unitarian?*

12 Brethren, I beseech you, be as I *am*; for I *am* as ye *are*:
13 ye have not injured me at all. Ye know how through infirmity
14 of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And
my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor
rejected; but received me as an angel of God, *even* as Christ

(9.) Appeal to Personal Relations (12–20).

He has no personal grudge against them; but his personal tenderness, loyalty, power, were well known to them of old, and are now illustrated by contrast among them.

12. *Brethren . . . at all. Be as I (am); for I (am) as ye are. For I am:* **because I also** (am). Paul is become as a Gentile (though he once was a passionate Jew). Their natural leanings toward Judaism they ought to sacrifice as well as he. Then observe the *brethren, I entreat you. Ye have not injured me at all* = (**Do not imagine that there is any personal grudge to be overcome**): but *have not injured* should rather be, **did not injure** (see ver. 13).

13, 14. *Ye know . . . as Christ Jesus.* **But ye know,** etc.: the **but** here is important in pointing out connection: **ye injured me not at all, but,** when I went to you in poor circumstances, you honoured me most highly. The two verses, 13 and 14, must be read as one sentence, completing between them the picture of that past time.

13. *How through infirmity,* etc.; better, **that on account of weakness.** *At the first:* lit. **on the former occasion.** Our version is better than (merely) **formerly.** The Greek here warrants the suggestion of a second visit of Paul (say that referred to in Gal. i. 9) before he wrote this Epistle. **Through infirmity** here does not mean, merely, **in a condition of mortal weakness:** it means, **on account of weakness:** that was the occasional cause of his first preaching in Galatia. This appears fairly warranted by the text; and there is no good reason for leaving it out of the translation. The weakness may have been general debility, resulting from great anxieties and toils. It has been supposed that Paul was feeble-eyed or blear-eyed (Acts xxii. 6, etc.), and that this special weakness had been aggravated at the time now in question. (See significant allusions to *eyes* in iii. 1 and iv. 15.)

14. *My temptation . . . nor rejected.* A better reading is, **your temptation.** The repeated allusion to Paul's *flesh* here, as the seat of the temptation, corroborates the opinion that what he alludes to is **bodily illness.** He can hardly have spoken thus about his being a little man (supposed to be referred to in 2 Cor. x. 10): it could not be a "temptation" in relation to Paul of Tarsus that he was not so tall as Saul the son of Kish. This temptation, besides (2 Cor. xii. 7) seriously trying him, so as to keep him low, appears to have been external to his natural constitution, a "*thorn* in the flesh," a "buffet of *Satan*." *Ye despised not, nor rejected* (your temptation): **did not contemn, nor repel with loathing** (which would have necessitated their parting with Paul, or at least despising him). This, again, strengthens the impression that Paul's infirmity must have been something special, over and above mere deficiency in stature. A primitive race like the Galatians has great reverence for physical perfection in manhood; but contemptuous revulsion from mere diminutive stature in Paul's case appears to be out of the question; even the imagination of such a

15 Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I
bear you record, that, if *it had been* possible, ye would have
plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me.
16 Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the
17 truth? They zealously affect you, *but* not well: yea, they
18 would exclude you, that ye might affect them. But *it is* good

revulsion, occasioned by something really revolting or offensive, may take us by surprise, until we recall to mind our own feelings when the dogs were licking the sores of some Lazarus at our gate.

But received . . . as Christ Jesus. Thus showing spirituality of apprehension. Paul really was an angel (messenger) of God in his office (1 Cor. iv. 1), and as ambassador of Christ (2 Cor. v. 20) was entitled to be received as the King (Matt. x. 40). But, after all, is it possible that Paul, who was deeply touched by that reception, may have feared that his broken-down condition would operate against him and his good cause, and wished that he had been as angel-faced Stephen?

15. *Where is then . . . spake of?* **Where, then, that** (or **yon**) **self-felicitation** (as if they had sung *hosannas*, cp. Luke xix. 37, 38)?

For I bear . . . to me. Of course this greatly favours the opinion that has been referred to about literal pain and weakness of Paul's eyes; though the expression may be only a strong metaphor, employed by a strong man strongly moved. The *to you* is somewhat emphatic. *Plucked out:* **dug out.**

16. *Am I therefore . . . the truth?* This translation seems needlessly to cloud the sense: which is,—**Is it so, that I am become your enemy** (in) **dealing truly** (**speaking truth**) **to you?** "In view of those happy days, is it possible that things should now have come to this?" *Enemy* may mean **one that hates you**, or, **one whom you hate.** Either sense would suit the text; and it seems impossible to make out with (warrantable) confidence which (if either) is to be preferred. The occasion of Paul's truthful dealing, which resulted in this tragedy, was in all probability that of his second visit (Acts xviii. 23), when (Gal. i. 9) he appears to have spoken to them with extraordinary energy the truth about apostasy (then beginning to manifest itself).

17, 18. It is extremely difficult to translate these two verses; because Paul rings the changes on a word (*zealously affect*, etc.) in a manner of which the English word is not susceptible. Perhaps **courting**, or **keenly courting**, would bring out the meaning, though inelegantly.

17. *They zealously . . . affect them:* **they keenly court you, not honourably** (in manner); **but they exclude you** (**so as to isolate you**), **in order that you may court them** (or, **where you may court them**—*i.e.* in your isolation). The dishonourableness of the courting consisted in falsehood of affection, pretending to seek the Galatians, really seeking the false teachers,—**whom Paul has not the heart to name.** Some questions have risen about *the excluding*—**from what?** Manifestly, so far as practicable, *from everything and every one* whose influence would tend to bring the Galatians back to loyalty to the gospel (and to Paul?), and thus back from their foolish fondness for the false teachers. The *where* in brackets, instead of *in order that*, is demanded by rigorous purity of Greek; but many have thought that Paul here is regardless of rigorous purity in his Greek.

18. *But it is good . . . with you.* **Now the honourable thing is to be courted always in an honourable manner, and not only during my**

to be zealously affected always in *a* good *thing*, and not only
19 when I am present with you. My little children, of whom I
20 travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you. I desire
to be present with you now, and to change my voice; for I
stand in doubt of you.

presence with you. It is a shame to the Galatians to be courted with shameful falsehood of affection. And it does them no great credit to have been courted with true-hearted loyalty during Paul's presence; seeing that they did not persevere in affection honourable to the beloved as well as the lover, but lapsed into the dishonourable position of being courted dishonourably as soon as the hero's back was turned. ("Base metal: perhaps God will purify it." See following verses.)

19, 20. *My little children . . . doubt of you.* In various respects this is an extraordinary outbreak of tenderness. Some difficulties of construction appear to have been occasioned simply by the disturbing influence of passionate grief and longing.

19. *My little children:* frequently employed by John; **here alone** employed by Paul. *Of whom I travail again in birth:* that is, **in a mother's anguish,** when her child is being born. But Paul's *again* shows that, while that anguish has endured, the end for which he travails belongs to a second period of their life. That is, *until Christ be formed in you.* The important word, for ascertainment of meaning, here is, *be formed.* Christ *was* in them through regeneration. His *being formed in* here means, His coming to be (Gal. ii. 20) in complete possession of their minds, hearts, lives. The completion of this process is reserved for the state of sinless perfection. But the process itself goes on through life of sanctification; and Paul's great passion of grief is occasioned by seeing, in the present conduct of the Galatians, that the process in their case is wofully interrupted.

20. *I desire . . . doubt of you.* I desire to be: **would that I were.** *Now:* emphatic, **at this moment** (when I am thus overcome by sorrow). And *to change my voice:* = "to speak not with the stern tones of warning at my second visit, nor with the rigorous expostulations of my present letter, but with the tender entreaties which perhaps would be unbecoming in strenuous controversial utterance of an apostle at a distance." *For I stand in doubt of you.* **In relation to you I am sorely perplexed** (nonplussed, bewildered)—as if not knowing *how* to proceed, and thinking that perhaps a personal visit like the first might bring back the happy, happy days.

Bodily aspect: 1. *Give O. T. expressions of reverence for physical perfection in manhood.* 2. *Give Scripture expressions apparently bearing on bodily aspect of Emmanuel.*

Courting: 1. *Did Paul ever seek to win men's affection to himself?* 2. *In this respect, how did his conduct differ from that of the false teachers?*

It is maintained that there cannot be a second regeneration. Would it follow that there may not be a second conversion? Give a case of what appears to be second conversion spoken of by the Lord.

(10.) Agar and Sarah, the Allegory (21–31).

In the law itself they ought to have seen that the position they choose, under the law, is one of slavery, forbidden to genuine Abrahamites.

John Newport

21 Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not
22 hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two
sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman.
23 But he *who was* of the bond woman was born after the
24 flesh; but he of the free woman *was* by promise. Which
things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants;

21. *Ye that desire to be:* **since ye will be.** *Under the law:* **under law** (see notes, on this expression, in vers. 4 and 5). *Do ye not hear the law:* here *the law* is correctly translated. But what is meant by *hearing* it is doubtful. Supposing the O. T. Scripture to have been read in Christian churches (as in Hebrew synagogues, Acts xv. 21), it would, of course, have been true that the Galatians literally were hearers of the law. But that supposition, otherwise precarious, is not here demanded by the argument; a quite good enough meaning is, **Do you not listen to, and respect, what the law says** (without implying that they literally heard the systematic reading of it)?

22. *For it is written.* Here we see that "the law" means the scriptural O. T. record; perhaps especially, or exclusively, that Pentateuch which sometimes had the proper name of "the law" (Luke xxiv. 44). *Two sons:* viz. Ishmael and Isaac—described in this order, that of their ages. *One of the bond woman:* **the one out of the slave-girl** (*the* = **the well-known** Hagar). *The other by a free woman:* lit. **and one out of the free** (woman).

23. *But . . . but:* better, **but . . . while.** The two words differ, and the sense here requires that the difference should be exhibited. *But he . . . the flesh:* here the reference to *the flesh* (= **according to flesh**) has no allusion to anything impure or unlawful, but simply means that Ishmael's birth took place **in a natural way, the ordinary manner,** as contrasted with Isaac's, which was extraordinary and supernatural. So *he of the free woman* (*was*) *by promise:* **(was born) through the promise** (*i.e. the* promise of a son to Abraham through Sarah's barren womb). But still, as in preceding argument, stress is here laid on *promise,* as marking the specialty of Abraham's religion of faith **in God.**

24. *Which things are an allegory:* **are** (or **have been**) **allegorized.** This expression, which is found in classic Greek, occurs only here in the N. T. It manifestly means that under the things spoken of—the two sons, with their contrast of parentage and position—there lies a spiritual meaning (now set forth, and perhaps previously lighted upon by some rabbis). That spiritual meaning he expects the Galatians to recognise (to whom, perhaps, he may have explained the matter). We might not have recognised the meaning he finds in those things, though we know that Isaac and his story are a signal illustration of the way of origination of true Abrahamites. But though we should not be qualified to find out the meaning (in such detail) for ourselves, we are entitled and bound to accept Paul's interpretation, if it be true that he is inspired of God, and as such qualified to give authoritative construction of the O. T. when God pleases. Some not thus qualified have made wild work with allegorical interpretation; but on this account to reject Paul's would be to play the infidel, not to exercise good sense in the use of what we receive through him from the Lord.

For these are the two covenants: (**testaments** in margin.) See notes on *covenant* in iii. 15, 17. *These* (here feminine, therefore) = **these women,** *i.e.* Agar and Sarah. *Are the two covenants:* the *the* here ought not to be. *Are*

the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage,
25 which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and
answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with
26 her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is
27 the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, *thou* barren
that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest

=mean (as in the cases, "This *is* my body"; and, "The rock was Christ"). *The one from the mount Sinai*, etc.: **one covenant from mount Sinai, bringing forth into bondage, who is Agar.**

25. *For this Agar:* lit. **this thing Agar** = the idea represented by Agar. *Mount Sinai in Arabia:* It has been (idly) endeavoured by many to get the *word* "Agar" to mean "Sinai." There is no call for any such straining. Arabia is that Arabic domain which, including as it did and does the Sinaitic peninsula, was the well-known site of the Mosaic legislation. It is not necessary even to suppose that Paul has in view the fact that the Arabian domain was the *habitat* of the Ishmaelites. He is making his way through picturesque circumstantials to the substance and heart of the things allegorized. And that he finds when he comes in view of Sinai, with its legislation constituting bondage. It is only as representing *that* Sinai that he can make out the mother who, for the purpose of his argument, "gendereth unto bondage." The circumstance that, not Ishmael personally, but the Jewish nation, dealt with God in the Sinaitic covenant, is precisely what enables Paul to bring his "allegory" home to Jewish legalists. In Ishmael's case we see the literal fact; in Israel's at Sinai, the spiritual fact it carried in its bosom.

Answereth to Jerusalem . . . her children. Answereth: **corresponds to, is the analogue of.** The correspondence here is in respect of the bondage which arises to her and her children from being "under law." *Jerusalem which now is:* lit. **the now Jerusalem**=the Jewish church as not having passed over to the faith of Messiah Jesus, or Judaism as rejecting the light and liberty of the new dispensation.

26. *Jerusalem . . . above*, etc. *Above* is here the only permissible translation, though in John iii. 3, 7 the expression which literally means "born from above" is (perhaps rightly) rendered "born again." To make our text mean "Upper Jerusalem" (=the higher part of the city), or "Ancient Jerusalem," is simply to play the blind man. The "Jerusalem from above" is the transcendental reality which, veiled under the old dispensation, is (John iv. 21) comparatively unveiled in the dispensation of grace, and (Rev. iii. 14, and xvi. 2, 10; Acts x. 9-18) destined to be fully and finally manifested in the reign of glory.

Free, which is mother of us all. The "all" here has not good textual warrant. And it is doubtful whether it does not detract from rather than add to the spirit and energy of text: "*Our* mother, the Jerusalem from above, is free"—*i.e. we* are very different in standing from slave-born slaves. The *us*, from force of the position=**Christians** (without exception).

27. *For it is written . . . husband: For the desolate . . . husband.* **For many are the children of the solitary woman more than of her who has a husband (the husbanded woman?).** The passage is quoted exactly from the Pent. of Isa. liv. 1. Isaiah has immediately before him desolation, and in the distance multitudinousness surprising and miraculous. This well applies even

not: for the desolate hath many more children than she
28 which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was,
29 are the children of promise. But as then he that was born
after the flesh persecuted him *that was born* after the Spirit,
30 even so *it is* now. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture?

to the Jerusalem above, because, though free, and mother of the free, she, like Sarah, is in herself barren: inasmuch as the new and true birth can be only according to promise, and by a miracle, direct supernatural operation, of God Almighty (Rom. iv. 16, 17; cp. John i. 11–13). But the special purpose of the apostle in making the quotation appears to be to show that the idea of a countless church (including Gentiles as well as Jews), springing out of spiritual nothingness, was apprehended under the O. T. as destined for realization under the New.

28. *Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.* *We* ought, perhaps, here to be, **ye**. *Children* ought not here to have the article. *As Isaac was* is a feeble translation: lit. **according to Isaac** (*à l'* Isaac): **Ye, brethren, Isaac-fashion, are children of promise.** The sort of rhetorical adoption implied in "ye, brethren," is not unbecoming here, when a Jew makes Gentiles to be of Isaac's sort in respect of birth.

29. *But* (strong adversative): **yet**: *as then, so also now* (carnality wars against spirituality, *e.g.* as set forth in ii. 21). "Notwithstanding your privilege by divine grace, such is your experience, too, through perversity of men."

After the flesh . . . after the Spirit: **according to flesh . . . according to Spirit**; see above notes on ver. 23. Here, too, the reference is to **natural** versus **supernatural** birth; and observe that *after Spirit* here corresponds to **through the promise** there. The incident referred to here (Gen. xxi. 8–12) is not to be construed as necessarily meaning that Ishmael (even then) hated in Isaac the gospel of free salvation by grace. All that we need to see in that incident is an illustration or picture, not necessarily a sample, of what is going on in Galatia, worldliness naturally and inevitably warring against the unworldly principles of the new kingdom (Gal. v. 17, anticipated in John xv. 19). But the *persecuted*, being in the imperfect tense (lit. = **went on persecuting**), may appear to describe, not an illustrative incident in Ishmael's case, but a chronic condition in the case of him and others. Mark how the Judaising movement, originating in vain confidence asserting something of power and privilege for self, really merits the description of a slave in disposition, and at heart is slavish in position. (Thus John viii. 33–37.)

30. *Nevertheless what saith the Scripture?* Better **but**, as in ver. 29. "(Even so it is now), but (while it is so on the part of man, it is not so by permission of God, for) What saith the Scripture?"

Cast out the bond woman . . . free woman. The quotation here (from Gen. xxi. 10) is free, and accommodated in form to Paul's immediate purpose, while giving the exact substance and spirit of Sarah's utterance. This utterance *the Scripture* not only records, but sets forth (*ibid.* ver. 12) as approved of God. The principle of it is that the born slave is not to be allowed to remain in the house as a rival to the true son and heir; but that the free-born son is to be in sole undisputed possession. In application to the Galatians, therefore, the meaning is: Judaism, religion of law, has no right to claim even a place in the new dispensation, and when (as now) it proves

Cast out the bond woman and her son: for the son of the
bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman.
31 So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond woman,
but of the free.

troublesome it must be expelled, because by divine appointment the honours of the house belong entirely to the religion of faith: even house-room to Judaism is not matter of right, but only by sufferance, and that only so long and so far as it leaves the gospel undisturbed in full possession.

31. *So then, brethren . . . of the free:* Wherefore, brethren, we are not. Let us hold by this in practice, and not act as if slaves, or half-slaves, in position and origin. Thus in next verse.

Ishmael was thrown out as a slave (woman's) son, yet several of the twelve patriarchs were sons of slaves: how account for the difference?
Is there any sense in which Jerusalem on earth is "mother of us all"?
Find traces of a kindly connection of Isaac with Ishmael after Abraham's death; also, of Israel with Ishmael's descendants.
Before Isaiah saw the multitudinousness of the people of Christ, mention two others who had seen it, and when, and how?

CHAPTER V.

1 STAND fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath
made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of

(1.) Stand fast in your Liberty achieved (v. 1–6).

Otherwise, you simply abandon Christ, and accept bondage of law pure and simple.

1. (About the order of the Greek words in this verse, the internal correlation of parts, and the relation of the whole to what goes before and after, there is an at first sight bewildering diversity of authorities. But at bottom there is no material difference as to results. I feel warranted in substantially accepting the text as rendered in our version.)

Stand fast therefore . . . hath made us free. Stand fast in: some would make, stand up to, make your stand for. The *therefore* is easily understood from vers. 21–31 of the preceding chapter. But a point is here made by, *with which Christ*, etc. = It is Christ that has given you this liberty; therefore, as Christians, you are bound to stand fast in it.

And be not . . . bondage. The word for *entangled* here means, implicated in a way which involves violence to spontaneous true life. *Yoke of bondage* may be contrasted with Christ's yoke (Matt. xi. 29, 30). which is compatible with fulness of true freedom (thus, "*law* of *liberty*," James i. 25). *Again* has generally been construed as referring back to the (legal) bondage implied in heathen religion. It may suffice to regard it as referring directly to the bondage constituted by Mosaism—a sort of thing of which heathens have had experience in their religions (of justification by law-works).

2 bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circum-
3 cised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to
every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the
4 whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whoso-
ever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.

2. *Behold . . . nothing.* Every word here is emphatic. (It is a poor suggestion that Paul here means to say, "I am of this opinion, though you should have imagined I am not.") The great teacher, with deliberation and solemnity (as in i. 1–4, and 8, 9), ascends the apostolic **throne** (Matt. xix. 28), assuming the full responsibility of dogmatizing in the name of God, and laying *on them* the full responsibility involved in receiving his utterance thus *ex cathedrâ*.

If ye be circumcised . . . nothing (cp. above, ii. 21). *Shall profit nothing, i.e.* "when the nature of religion is shown by its results." To *be circumcised* here =**accepting circumcision** (as, more or less, a matter of religion). Even for a Jew, to whom at first circumcision was a harmless custom, to make **a religion** of circumcision is to lapse from *Christ* (from His gospel to "another gospel," i. 6, 7). But for a Galatian Gentile to submit to circumcision, in present circumstances, can hardly have a meaning except making a religion of it, relying upon it as a ground of justification. He, therefore, in submitting to it, is formally embracing *a principle* (of justification through law-works) subversive of the one only true gospel.

3. *For I testify . . . whole law. Testify* here=**solemnly protest**, as in the sight of God and other witnesses. *Every man that is circumcised*=**all who submit to circumcision** (as set forth in ver. 2, see note). *Debtor to do the whole law:*=**under "unlimited liability"** in relation to all its precepts; and that in this sense, that if he do not perfectly obey them all always (see notes on iii. 10), he cannot be justified, he must be condemned, **on the principle** he has accepted in resorting to circumcision as a ground of acceptance with God. *Every man* is here=**every human being**, thus making Paul's "testification" all the more solemnly emphatic. *Is circumcised* is lit. (present tense) **goes on being circumcised**, *i.e.* **lives on the way of circumcision**, freely and consciously accepting **that as his** way of life. *Again* is best explained by the supposition that Paul (see note on i. 9) had solemnly warned them to this effect on occasion of his second visit. And the *for* means, this is the reason for the *Christ shall profit nothing* (in ver. 2).

4. *Christ* here, by place, is strongly emphatic, resuming the emphasis on *Christ* in ver. 2; as if Paul had said, "Again and again I declare, in the name of God, that you are **not Christians** when you rely on law-works for justification: *Christ* will not become a partner with you in this ('unlimited liability') enterprise of yours. If you do not allow Him to be everything, He (for you) is nothing."

Become . . . grace. The sentence may be freely rendered thus: **Abolished from Christ are all you who seek justification by law, from grace have you fallen away.** *By law:* lit. **in law** (cp. "in grace," i. 6); not, like the *by law* in iii. 21, lit. **out of** (or from) law. Here Paul regards the Judaiser, who seeks justification on the ground of law-works, as thereby placing himself *in* **a sphere and system** (of legalism) which is outside of the sphere and system of grace. *Grace* here, lit. (?) **the grace** (*that* thing which in this Epistle is known by this name).

5 For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness
6 by faith. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth
any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

5. *For we . . . by faith.* The **for we** here is emphatic. It expands the *I Paul* in ver. 2 perhaps further than the *all the brethren which are with me* in i. 2. It means, "we *Christians* (as such)," with the *innuendo* that Judaisers (as such) are not Christian :=" It is of the essence of *our* Christian religion," etc.

Through the Spirit: lit. **in Spirit**, or, **in our spiritual-minded way.** The text does not demand that "the Spirit" here should be the Personal Sanctifier. But it demands something more than, as in iv. 29, simple supernaturalism or unworldliness. The exigency of the place is met by making it to mean, "according to the genius of our (spiritual) *Christian* religion;" but that meaning almost constrains us (see iv. 6) to regard *Paul* as here meaning to affirm that what he says is what is taught by the Third Person of the Godhead.

Wait for=**are looking out for, keenly looking for:** this is our characteristic attitude. *The hope of righteousness* here is probably **the hoped-for righteousness** (see iii. 22). This is consistent with the supposition that the waiters *have*, complete and definitive, that righteousness (of God) which is the only ground of justification. For—1. The thing hoped for here may be the *final* declaration of that righteousness as previously attained, with the fruits of that declaration; and 2. The *hope* may mean simply, **we look** to that quarter for righteousness,—no matter whether we now have it or not;—a thing which every evangelical Christian has in his heart whenever he prays for forgiveness and acceptance.

By faith: as in iii. 2, 5, 7, 8. The original here, as in the places referred to, admits a variety of shades of meaning, according to the office assigned to *faith* in the places respectively. If it be connected with *we in Spirit*, then the meaning is here, as in iii. 7, **we, being of faith (wait).** If with *wait*, then, as in iii. 2, 5, the meaning is, **by faith (we wait).** If with *righteousness*, as in iii. 7, the meaning is, as in our version, **(righteousness which is) by faith.** All these renderings suit the general meaning of the clause.

6. *For in Christ Jesus.* The *for* here means that our *waiting* (ver. 5) is not arbitrary, but is dictated by the very essence of our religion as Christians, who believe in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. *In* (Him) recalls to mind the position and thought and feeling of Christians as **contained in** Him (spiritually, no doubt, but here legally,—to start from). Cp. "in law," ver. 4; and "through the Spirit," ver. 5; (with notes). If "in Spirit" represents the atmosphere of the new life of Christians, "in Christ Jesus" represents the sunlight of it. Christ, therefore, is also the sphere of Christian life, as the sun (John viii. 12) is the world's life,—a sphere outside of the sphere and system of legalism. And as the world, in relation to the sun's life-giving light, is simply receptive, so in relation to Christ the proper correlate, on the soul's part, is faith, which simply receives, and alone receives, "of His fulness" (John i. 16).

Neither . . . uncircumcision. Paul here modifies (apparently) his preceding condemnation of "circumcision" as equivalent to apostasy from life in Christ. Here he makes it to be, not a nuisance, but a nullity. It is a dangerous, and may be a deadly, nuisance, in the special circumstances, when

made a ground of justification. In relation to the same circumstances and purpose "uncircumcision" is good, at least as involving immunity from a most formidable evil. But in the present text Paul is thinking only of the question, What, according to the ground principle of Christianity, is the producing cause of justification (or of salvation)? And in relation to this question he says, both alike, "circumcision" and "uncircumcision," have simply **no power.**

Availeth anything: here=**has an effective force,** as producing cause.

But faith. The stress here is on *faith.* "According to Christ's religion, as experienced by us in Him, **only faith** has power,"—that is, as producing cause of justification (or salvation). Thus "circumcision" and "uncircumcision," as outward states, are alike powerless. How faith can be powerful as a producing cause, while justification (or salvation) is only from God, is understood when we think of **occasional** or **instrumental** cause. The man who opens the sluice-gate is the instrumental cause of the mill-wheel's turning, but the efficient cause is the stream (thus set free to work).

Which worketh by love. (Cp. 1 Cor. vii. 19, and Gal. vi. 15.) In the three places in which the *formula* ("neither, nor, but") occurs, the logical order is this:—1. "New creature;" 2. "Working by love;" 3. "Keeping God's commandments." In 1 Cor. vii. 19, the verb is=**is nothing**; while in the two places in Gal. the verb means, **exercises no power, is nohow effective.** At least in 1 Cor. vii. 19, the reference is to that sort of "justification" discussed by James (see Introd. pp. 36, 37),—justification by works, works being *evidence* of reality of (professed) Christian faith and life. In our text the reference is (presumably) to the sort of justification discussed by Paul here,—*i.e.* pardon and acceptance given freely on the ground of God's righteousness in Christ. Thus, while new creation alone is anything in the way of true life possessed, and while keeping God's commandments alone has effective force in showing that a man is a new creature, it is set forth in our text (at least) that **faith alone** (which worketh by love) is effective in order to justification into life.

Worketh: **is energetic.** Romanists some generations ago tried to make this mean, **is energized** (as if love working itself out through faith had been the ground of justification). Christian scholars in the Romish communion will not now contend for this bad Greek.

By love (1 Thess. i. 3). Here (see Introd. pp. 36, 37) Paul visibly coincides with James: also with the famous Protestant saying (about *sola*), "Faith alone justifies, but the faith which justifies is not alone." That faith's works of love are not the ground of justification before God is the main proposition of this Epistle. The point here, in relation to that faith (which "alone justifies"), is, that it must be *genuine* faith, whose genuineness (Gal. ii. 20) is shown by good works of the (professed) believer. *How* justifying faith is effective for sanctification may be understood from such statements as those in Luke vii. 47; John xiii. 14, 15; and 2 Cor. iii. 18.

If justification be free, how can it make men feel bound to serve God in Christ?

If justification be dependent on our goodness and good works, how will that make us unlikely to serve God in Christ?

Does the argument here, "Stand fast in liberty, for it is Christ that has freed you," apply only to the spiritual life of individual believers? Illustrate, from Scripture history and general history—(1) of the Church, (2) of the nation.

7 Ye did run well; who did hinder you, that ye should not
8 obey the truth? This persuasion *cometh* not of him that
9 calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.
10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be
none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear

(2.) On the Cause or Causers of the sad Declension (7–12).

Men who have to answer to God for their crime, a crime in which Paul is certainly no partaker.

7. *Ye did run well:* ye were running admirably. The foot-race again; see ii. 2, with note. *Who did hinder you . . . the truth?* The *who* emphatic, as if expressing surprise that any one should have been able to hinder them: (= who in all the world?) *Hinder:* in the best Greek reading the word for *hinder* is descriptive of stopping an army on the march, by breaking up the roads. In the "received" Greek text, the word alludes to an officer at the public games, whose business it was to keep the course clear for a race, by beating back those not entitled to run. *That ye should not obey the truth.* The Greek suggests this as a purpose in view of the hinderers. *The truth*, at least especially if not exclusively, is the gospel truth in ii. 14. The expression *to obey* (the gospel) is very significant, showing that the affections and the will go into the act of true saving faith.

8. *This persuasion:* better, the persuasion. The *persuasion* here may be either active, referring to the agency of others on the mind, or passive, referring to the result of that agency in the mind. The former meaning best suits the connection. The root of the word here is the same as the root of the word for *obey* in ver. 7. *Him that calleth you: i.e.* God (see i. 6, with note). It is not strictly necessary to suppose that the present tense here refers to a present action of God; it may simply be meant to describe Him as "The Caller." But it at least suggests, what is otherwise known as a fact, that God, having once for all effectually called sinners in conversion, thenceforward continuously calls them on and up through grace toward glory: as the sun, having called the plant into inchoate life in spring, goes on, through summer and autumn, calling it into bud, and blossom, and fruit.

9. *A little . . . lump.* Does the *little leaven* here mean, a small knot of false teachers? or, a small infusion of unsound doctrine? The question seems hardly worth discussing, for it does not affect Paul's meaning. His meaning simply is, a small amount of evil influence once admitted. The proverbial expression is by Christ, in Matt. xiii. 33, employed in good sense. But as a rule, by Jews (and even by Gentiles) the leaven was regarded as an unclean thing. And in our text the point is, warning against admitting even a small amount of evil influence (in the shape, say, of false doctrine), because the evil once admitted natively tends to spread through and through the whole mass into which it has entered. *Lump* here = (Americanism) "baking."

10. *I have confidence toward you . . . minded. I* is here emphatic = as for me. *In you:* lit. to you, here = in relation to you. *Through the Lord:* far better, lit. in the Lord. It is in the Lord that Paul has this confidence relatively to the Galatians. Accordingly, the word for *I have confidence* is one expressing full persuasion. (See above note on *persuasion* in ver. 8.

11 his judgment, whosoever he be. And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then

The English reader cannot be made to see how Paul here rings the changes on one root word and thought.) *That . . . minded. That ye will be* here is future indicative = simply, **that ye shall be.** Not necessarily, "when you have read my letter," but perhaps, "in the long run, in God's good time," you shall prove to be *none*, etc. The *none otherwise minded* has by many been supposed to refer to only what is said in vers. 8, 9 : = "you shall (prove to) be of one mind with me **in this.**" It is probably better to regard Paul as meaning, generally, "**in relation to my gospel,** for which I am now contending, and which at first was so fervently embraced by you, I am, notwithstanding the insidious leaven, confident that you shall prove, after all, to be leal and true at heart." The suggestion that here, in separating the Galatians from the false teachers, he is deliberately acting on the maxim, "Divide and conquer," seems almost inhuman.

But he . . . he be. He that troubleth here (contrasted with Paul by the *but*) traces the leaven in ver. 9 to **personal** agency. It is not necessary to suppose that Paul has any one individual in his view. It suffices to understand him as saying, **whoever plays the troubler.** The word for *troubling* here is the same as in i. 7 (see note there). *Whosoever he be* = **no matter who,** *e.g.* though he should stand very high in some respects. (Thus "if we, or an angel," in i. 8.) *Shall bear his judgment:* lit. **shall bear the condemnation.** The word for *bear* means, **carry a** (heavy) **burden. The condemnation** certainly is that of God, and probably alludes to the great day of judgment.

11. *And I, . . . persecution? And I:* but **I.** The *I* here is emphatic. The most reasonable suggestion here, in relation to this abrupt transition from the false teachers to Paul's person and preaching, is that (perhaps on account of such conformity to Mosaism as that recorded in Acts xvi. 3) it had been whispered, "Paul himself, who has so denounced circumcision in Galatia, preaches it elsewhere (where it suits him)." *If I yet preach circumcision: preach* is present indicative : = **I am in the habit of preaching** (or, **do preach**). The *yet* (= **still**) here has reference to time. The *past* time thus alluded to can be only the period before Paul's conversion ; for there is not a shadow of reason for imagining that after that event, so momentous for the world, he ever did anything like preaching circumcision. But in that past time, thus understood, did he *preach* (circumcision, or anything else)? Most probably he did : a man so able and eloquent is not likely to have restricted himself to mere silent persecution of the new religion. But though he had not *preached* before his conversion, the *yet preach*, relatively to the after period, has a perfectly intelligible meaning = "*so far* go on substantially on the old line,—though in a manner that is new." But the main point here is made by *circumcision:* "*if circumcision* be preached by me (or, be my preaching) up to this time." *Why . . . persecution:* the *yet* here, though in Greek the same word as in the previous clause, has a different meaning : just as our "yet," which there means "still" (in point of time), can here mean "nevertheless" (in point of logic). *Suffer persecution*, present indicative, here = **go on being persecuted, am a persecuted man.**

Then is the offence of the cross ceased. The word for *ceased* here is that for *made of none effect* in ver. 4 (see note there). *Then:* argument, "If I now preach up circumcision, it follows that there is no occasion to persecute me, the occasion is cut off from being and operation" (*reductio ad absurdum*).

12 is the offence of the cross ceased. I would they were even
cut off which trouble you.

13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use*

Offence: **stumbling-block** (as in Rom. xi. 9), what occasions a fall. The word suggests anger, and angry violence, as resulting from the fall, or from striking against the block (Matt. xxiv. 10; 1 Cor. i. 23). *Of the cross:* = that thing in (the preaching of) Christ crucified which occasioned the angry violence of unconverted Jews (1 Cor. i. 22, 23): viz. (not only the, to them, shocking suggestion that the promised Messiah had died a death of shame, but also and especially, what cut far more deeply home into the self-righteousness of their hearts), the proclamation of free salvation on the ground of God's righteousness, to the exclusion of all righteousness of man, so that circumcision, and such law-works, are for saving purposes needless and useless.

Paul's *persecution* here is not necessarily that only which he underwent at the hand of unconverted Jews. At this time he is undergoing veritable persecution, to him most painful, in the Christian communities of Galatia and of Corinth, though not in the coarse form of bodily violence. In Galatia, at least, it is on account of his preaching down "circumcision." If he were only to preach it up, he would not be a persecuted martyr there (in absence).

12. *I would that . . . trouble you.* The word for *troubling* here is not that for *troubling* in ver. 10 and i. 7. It rarely occurs, and only in later Greek. It literally means, **removing from the ground on which one stands.** In Acts xvii. 6, and xxi. 38, it describes **radical revolution.** Here it means, in effect, carrying men away from "the Jerusalem above" to Sinai in Arabia. *Were even cut off:* the expression here is mistranslated. It is in the middle voice, not in the passive (as if one were to say, "I wish they would go and hang themselves"). The *cut off*, judging from the concurrent opinions of ancient Greek commentators, and the best scholars among modern commentators, has reference to one of the varied forms of **self-mutilation** which in heathen lands were practised as a religious service. Paul's *would that* need not be construed as meaning that he seriously desired that self-mutilation. But *the moral judgment* it implies, of the deserts of those troublers, is far more terribly expressed in the imprecatory Psalms, and, indeed, in Paul's own utterance, i. 8, 9. Christians in the then heathen world were familiar with language, and Christian teachers *had* to use language, that would be felt intolerable in Christendom, purified and exalted by Christ through their teachings.

Give cases of self-mutilation as a religious service: from Scripture, and from profane history.

If the false teachers were under such condemnation, were not the Galatians who accepted their teaching under the same condemnation?

Trace through Scripture the use of the leaven for teaching purposes.

Why did the Jews, distinctively, find in the gospel a stumbling-block, while the Greeks, distinctively, found in it foolishness?

(3.) Liberty not Licence, but Love (13–15).

If the Galatians think that Paul, speaking against law as covenant of works, imagine that he is against it as a rule of life, let them listen to this:—

13. *For, brethren, ye:* much better, **for ye, brethren.** The *ye* is emphatic,

not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one
14 another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in

and, as emphatic, accounts for the *for* in this way :—"My tremendous wish in ver. 12, relatively to the troublers, means my ardent longing for *your* persistence in Christian liberty" (ver. 1). Mark the frequent occurrence of *brethren* at this stage; meaning kindly interest breaking out into unrestrained utterance, after the painful work of remonstrance and sorrowful reproach is done.

Have been called unto liberty: were called to be upon a footing of liberty, were called on to a ground of liberty. For the Greek here we have not idiomatic English, excepting in some such awkward form as this.

Only (*use*) *not liberty:* lit. (?) the liberty = *that* to which you are called; or, *that* (*noble*) *thing*, liberty. The *use*, or some such word (*turn* would probably be a better word), is implied in the Greek, and has to be supplied in the English at some expense of rhetorical energy. *An occasion:* here = starting-point, like the spring-board for a diver. *The flesh.* This presupposes that *the flesh* (see note on "flesh" in ii. 16; and below, vers. 16, 17, with notes) in man as sinful is ever ready to break out into lawless excesses if not restrained by something higher and better than man's nature as corrupted; so that even the removal of artificial restraint may involve danger to be guarded against. It gives no countenance to the suggestion that man's nature as such, even the corporeal part of it, has in it any native proclivity towards evil: that suggestion, involving a calumny on the Creator of man, is Manichæan or heathenish, not Christian. The *only*, marking an anxious fear that liberty should be perverted into licence, does not necessarily imply that Paul has in view the distinctively fervid temperament of Gauls: his utterance is sufficiently accounted for by his view of the corrupted nature of man.

But by love serve one another. But: adversative = "Instead of abusing liberty as an occasion for licence, do this." *By love:* lit. (?) through the love, "through that well-known grace;" or, simply, through love (a species of thing well known). Love is the positive side of that holiness to which we are called, into which we are emancipated, by the gospel. The mere negative purity may in a sense be achieved through ascetic suppression of manhood. But where natural human affections are suppressed, "liberty" can hardly have a meaning: a dead man is not free in the noble gospel sense. *Serve one another.* The root word for *serve* here (see notes on "bond" in iii. 28, and on "servant" in iv. 1) meant ordinarily *bond*-service or slavery. The detailed exhortations about relative duties in Eph. v. 21, etc., are introduced by the general formula, "submitting yourselves unto one another;" and go on uniformly placing the inferior's duty before the superior's. The love to which we are called, as true liberty's proper outgoing, is thus set forth under its highest, most heroic aspect (see John xiii. 34, 35; cp. *ibid.* vers. 12–15). Paul himself, always strenuously free, is the slave not only of Christ, but of Christians (2 Cor. iv. 5). Thus that love, which is the true realization of liberty, is most completely realized in washing the brethren's feet. Act on this principle, and there will be no danger of your liberty lapsing into licence. Observe in ver. 6 the vital connection of *love* with *faith*.

14. *All the law:* the whole law. *Is fulfilled* (present tense): a better reading is (perfect tense) has been fulfilled = "is *completely* obeyed." (See Rom. xiii. 10.) The question here is about *fulfilling* (relatively to "one another," ver. 13). Mere abstention from injury to our neighbour (Rom. xiii. 9) is short of *fulfilling*. The law makes a channel in which our

15 this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

obedience is to flow. But mere abstention from injury leaves that channel empty and dry (which, of course, is better than a poisonous stream of hate). The *fulfilling*, the beneficent stream, is constituted by love freely flowing in that channel. This is true equally of **the whole law**, or all its detailed precepts. These are only so many separate channels for the guidance of the one thing, love, which alone fills them, all and every one, as a beneficent stream. *In one word . . . in this* (=viz. **in the word**). (See Matt. xxii. 35–40.) The "one word" in the Lord's great statement referred to is LOVE. But Paul at present is speaking only of relative duties between man and man; and in this relation that "one word," **love**, means, of course—

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Neighbour—in Heb. **fellow-(man)**—is lit. **the man who is near you = the one whom you are able to reach** with your love (see Luke x. 29–37). *As thyself:* see the "golden rule" in Matt. vii. 12. Abstractly, this rule is involved in the Stoical maxim that a man should regard the universe as a system of monads, and himself as only one monad in that system, and feel and act accordingly; and also in Kant's "Categorical Imperative," "Act from a maxim fit to become law in a system of universal legislation;" and in other such maxims of ethical schools. What makes the rule in Scripture to be truly "golden" is that it is avowedly intended for the guidance of *love*, the true principle of morality in action. *N.B.*—Self-love, so far as it is only wise self-regard, as distinguished from selfishness, is here not prohibited but presupposed. Absence of wise self-regard is not morality, but inhuman prodigality.

The law. It is arbitrary to restrict this to the moral law (even in its two tables). There is no good reason why it should not extend to all positive laws imposed with due authority. While the matter immediately in Paul's view is relative duty of man to man, as set forth in the second table of the Decalogue, **the principle** of love applies alike to all fulfilment of all commands: without love, a complete system of conformity to all precepts entitled to obedience is only a complete system of empty channels.

15. *But if . . . of another. Bite, devour, consumed*,—figures taken from the rage of beasts of prey,—present an obvious gradation to a climax. The *biting* of controversy naturally runs into the *devouring* of controversial mood waxing fierce with indulgence. And the controversialists, each eagerly occupied with snapping at and gnawing his antagonist, are apt all to forget that the natural tendency of this is to *consume* the Christian community, to destroy the Christian cause. The *odium theologicum* may be creditable to theologians as showing their glowing ardour, but its native tendency is to ruin the kingdom of Christ. Therefore, no matter how high and heroic you may think your mood, *take heed* if it impel you to *bite* and *devour* a Christian.

If all our obedience be imperfect, how can Christians be said with truth to fulfil the whole law?

How do the "Two Great Commandments" stand related to the "Ten Words"?

Is destructive criticism of a theological adversary always unlawful? Is not Paul himself now biting and devouring the false teachers? What principle have we for guidance in the application of his warning here?

16 *This* I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil

(4) Antidote against Worldliness: Practice of Godliness (16–18).

To be fully occupied with spiritual life in action, that is the way to be pre-occupied against carnality in outgoing affection.

16. (*This*) *I say then:* = (Upon the above things) here are my observations. *Walk . . . flesh:* = to walk in the Spirit is to guard effectually against fleshly lust.

Walk in the Spirit (lit. in Spirit), in the present text might mean simply, be "spiritual-minded" in your walk, thus leaving out of view the Personal Sanctifier. But ver. 18 plainly brings in the Third Person of the Godhead, Who has already been introduced unmistakeably in iv. 6. The connection, therefore, seems to demand the construction here, walk in the Holy Ghost—a construction not forbidden by the circumstance that *Spirit* here has not the article (*the*). What it is to walk in that adorable Person—to have His being as the element in which the human spirit lives and moves—can easily be understood theoretically: as every one understands what it is to live and move in vital air (*spiritus*). But some emphasis falls to be laid on the *walking* (see ver. 25): *i.e.* "not only *be* in the Spirit, but *walk* in Him; not only *have* the life which is in Him, but *live* it" (2 Tim. i. 6): to live *this* life is the way to avoid a carnal life. See illustration of contrast in Matt. xii. 43-45. The paradox implied in *our walking* here, as compared with divine leading in ver. 18, is anticipated in the life of Jesus (see Luke iv. 1; Matt. iv. 1; and Mark i. 12), and is broadly exhibited by Paul in Phil. ii. 12, 13.

And ye shall not fulfil = and so ye shall not fulfil. The Greek here admits the construction, and ye shall not, in the sense of prohibition; but the strain of the passage requires that which we have given, and which is fully consistent with the Greek. The word for *fulfil* here is not that for *fulfil* in ver. 14. Here it is lit. carry to an end, or into effect. The meaning is, "your life in its outgoing shall not consist in indulgence of carnal affections, being otherwise occupied, preoccupied, filled up, with faith's labours of love." But mark, Paul does not say nor hint that "there is no sin but in sinning;" that the affection towards evil is not in itself evil, though it should not be let loose into action (see Rom. vii. 7). What he now has to do with is only evil *action* (*e.g. biting* and *devouring*), to be guarded against by pre-occupation with beneficent activity of love. (Spanish proverb: "A busy man may be tempted by the devil: an idle man tempts the devil to tempt him.")

The lust: lit. lust ("lust of flesh ye shall not carry out into effect"). *Lust* is abstractly an affection toward an object, impelling or soliciting towards action that terminates on or in the object. Thus in ver. 17 our translators make *the Spirit* to *lust;* and in 1 Tim. iii. 1, and Phil. i. 23, the word here translated *lust* (there "desire") manifestly describes a truly spiritual affection. But commonly in Scripture the word means "inordinate affection"—affection not regulated by law nor controlled by true love; and this even where there is no express qualification *in malam partem* (*e.g.* in Rom. vii. 7, where "concupiscence," useful for a certain controversial purpose, to an English reader conceals the sense rather than reveals it). But in our text

17 the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye

that qualification is abundantly supplied, both by the contrast of *flesh* to *Spirit*, and by the subsequent description of the impulses and operations of the two.

Of the flesh: lit. **of flesh = fleshly** or **carnal**. See notes on "flesh" in ii. 16 and v. 13. In 1 John ii. 16 *the flesh* ("lust of") manifestly means **the animal side of manhood**, as distinguished from the sensuous imagination and the imperious (self-)will. Here *flesh* embraces **the whole of manhood** as influenced by affections that are depraved because simply worldly, and therefore ungodly. To the really Manichæan suggestion, that moral evil is, in any measure, traceable to the physical or corporeal constitution of man as distinguished from the rational, no countenance whatever is given, either by Paul here or by John as referred to above. And that, even when that suggestion is repudiated, it is worse than arbitrary to make the *flesh* here anything less than the **totality of man as incarnate**, appears from the following description of "works of the flesh," among which are "hatred, variance, emulations," etc. (vers. 20, 21), which have nothing directly to do with man's corporeal part, and which may flourish among bodiless spirits, and also among men (calling themselves "the spirituality") who, as far as possible, by suppressing and stamping out natural affection, reduce themselves from men into ghosts.

17. *For the flesh . . . the flesh.* On *lusting*, see above note under ver. 16. The *for* here has been regarded as meaning "**for, you know**" = an appeal to the personal experience of exercised Christians. Certainly this ver. 17 is not necessary for the continuity of thought between vers. 16 and 18.

And these . . . the other. There appears to be a preponderance of evidence in favour of **for** here instead of *and*. But the main fact is that *these . . . other: these* (= **flesh and spirit**) **are reciprocally in (active) antagonism.** Of reciprocal antagonism on the part of two principles of action, each of which has some hold of man, we read in Rom. vii. 14–25. But while there what we see is the regenerate spirit of man agonizing against remaining depravity, here (see note on "Spirit" in ver. 16) the agonist on the good side appears to be the Holy Spirit of God (as, of course, it is at bottom in Rom. vii. 14–25). There is something which, though very awful (Phil. ii. 12), yet is very consoling in the thought that, through the Christian's sore battle, the Battler is God Almighty. Paul thus can attach a real and strong meaning to "love of the Spirit" (**Rom. xv. 30**).

So that . . . ye would. The *so that* here is probably = **to the end that**, as well as **to the effect that.** This depends upon the right construction of the clause as a whole, which I suppose to be as follows: The *will* of (regenerate) man is the "objective point" aimed at by the two agonists in this war. But the will here is not (*voluntas*) the mere abstract faculty of volition, but (*volens*) concretely, the willer, the man himself regarded as moral agent. And *each* agonist strives to prevent him from doing what he *would* (lit. **may** (or **might**) **will**: *the flesh*, when he is disposed to do good, and *the Spirit*, when he is disposed to do evil. *Cannot do* is **may not do** ("so as to prevent you, or with a view to prevent you, from doing"). In this "Holy War" a Bunyan would, of course, have a personal evil spirit as antagonist to the Holy

18 would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

Ghost. Paul has only the impersonal evil principle represented by the word *flesh*. And in truth the grand fact for us is that there is a Personal Spirit, who is God Almighty, antagonistic to evil in those who accept Christ as their Saviour and King. The wonder is, that it should be possible to say with truth that in a regenerate man there is any need of warfare on God's part for preventing him from doing what he fain would do. This theoretical wonder is familiar in experience of Christians. Suppose that the *will*, as in Rom. vii. 14–25, the man's proper personality or self, is at bottom regenerate—under the influence of "the Spirit" as a principle of good action. In respect of this deepest and truest self, the regenerate man may (1 John iii. 6, 9) be spoken of as sinless and impeccable. But in the regenerate man there is, alongside of that,—"indwelling corruption,"—a remaining power of the *flesh*, a principle of (motive power towards) evil action, which may be operative and fruitful while the good principle lies dormant; so far, even, that the new and true man may be carried away into action that is alien from and revolting to his new and true nature. Hence the need of vigilance and prepossession—fore-arming as well as fore-warning (Eph. vi. 10–18).

These: lit. **those things.** It is perhaps idle to inquire whether Paul is not here (as in Eph. vi. 10, etc.) looking to the *universal* nature of the two antagonistic principles of good and evil, while making special application to the case of man, as that immediately in view, of what must always and everywhere hold true in relation to the two kingdoms of darkness and light.

18. *But if . . . the law.* Observe that ver. 17 may be regarded as parenthetical, so that this verse may be regarded as a continuation of what is said in ver. 16.

Led of the Spirit, see above note, under ver. 16, on "Walk in the Spirit." The meaning is lit. **actuated by Spirit.** But here the literal rendering would fail to bring out the sense. Look at Rom. viii. 1–17. The apostle there begins with expressions descriptive of **a principle of good** in the regenerate. He goes on (vers. 9, 11) to ascribe that principle of spiritual-mindedness to the indwelling and operation of the Spirit of God. And he ends (vers. 14–17) with a series of expressions which look like so many paraphrases or expansions of curt and pregnant utterances in our Epistle: the first of the series being, "As many as are led by **the Spirit of God.**" This expression represents a thought which habitually dwells in Paul's mind in relation to the *leading* of which he speaks in our text. The thought is one on which he has really been dwelling all through this Epistle (or which, if one may so speak, has been hovering over him, and surrounding him, as the atmosphere of his soul's life). And the reasonable inference is, that he expresses it here,—as when a flash of electricity breaks out from a full-charged electric vase,—though elliptically as compared with Rom. viii. 14; and consequently that our translators here give his precise meaning. (The vaguer forms of the Greek would in our English idiom have failed to give the precise meaning.)

Not under the law: lit. **not under law** (*under*, as above, having an accusative of motion). A good theological meaning, in harmony with the foregoing part of this Epistle, would be constituted by the statement, "**For justification** you are not dependent on law, but on Christ." But the remarkable expression in ver. 23, "Against such there is no law," warrants the supposition that Paul here is passing over to a new point of view (which men of his way of thinking

19 Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these;*
20 Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry,
witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions,
21 heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and
such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told
you in time past, that they which do such things shall not

can see to be vitally connected with the old). If the clause now before us be an adumbration of what is expressed in ver. 23, then the meaning is simply, (if you be led by the Spirit so as spontaneously to do what God commands, then) **you are under no irksome constraint of law.** To him that loves, law, in the sense of detailed precept, is not irksome bondage, but delightful direction. (See James i. 25, and Rom. vii. 22.)

What is the special meaning, respectively, of the expressions, "Walking in the Spirit," "walking in love," "walking by faith," and "walking with God."

What do you say to the statement that "the natural affections as such are morally characterless"? If this statement be supposed as true, how can it be said with truth that man's nature is corrupt?

Is it right to repress a really natural affection, e.g. *towards food in a hungry man? If not, why not?*

(5.) The Flesh and the Spirit in Action (19–26).

If you wish to know how to apply the exhortation about flesh and Spirit, look at this catalogue of their respective results, and consider what is meant by being Christ's.

19–23. *Now the works . . . no law.* Space does not permit elaborate commentary on the following details. Careful consideration of the two lists, of vices and graces, as compared with one another, and as each involving a certain panoramic order of exhibition, will be found very profitable. *Works . . . fruit.* It has been supposed that *works* is applied to *the flesh* here, because vices are **not** properly **a natural growth,** but rather a monstrous excrescence; and that *fruit* is applied to *the Spirit,* because all the graces in exercise are a true and proper growth out of His indwelling operation. Perhaps this is over-refining.

19–21. *Now the works . . . of God. Are manifest: i.e.* **are easily seen and recognised,** so that thus far there is no difficulty in applying the exhortation in ver. 16. *Of the which* (ver. 21): **as to which.** *I tell you before:* "in view of coming judgment according to works, awaiting you and me."

As . . . time past: **even as also I formerly said,**—possibly on occasion of his first visit; and probably with greater emphasis on occasion of his second visit, when he saw the beginnings of degeneracy from first love and its fruits. *They which do such things:* = **they of whom such things are the practice.** *Inherit the kingdom:* = **enter into full and definitive possession of the kingdom** (Matt. xxv. 34).

Which are (the *these* appears quite needless and useless). Commentators have here found four species (under the genus referred to in the expression,

22 inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is
love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,
23 Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.
24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the

such like) : 1. **Sensual vices** (leave out *adultery* as without good textual authority), viz. *fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness* (= "uncleanness becoming wanton and impudent"). 2. **Theological vices**, viz. *idolatry* and *witchcraft* (a word which **may** mean either **poisoning** or **sorcery**, but which here can mean only **sorcery**,—see on "*hocussing*" under iii. 1,—because *murders* have a place of their own in ver. 20). 3. **Malevolent vices**, viz. *hatred, variance* (= **strife** in temper), *emulations* (lit. "**zeals**," like the "zeal" in iv. 17, 18, but here **possessed with a devil**), *wrath* (lit. **wraths** = **passionate outbursts** of anger), *seditions* (= **party caballings**), *divisions, heresies* (here = **keen controversial partisanship**), *envyings, murders;* and 4, **vices of Excess**, *drunkenness, revellings* (**wassailings** or **compotations**, especially at night).

22. *But the fruit . . . temperance.* The singular *fruit*, as compared with the plural *works*, is perhaps significant of the fact that the results of *the Spirit's* indwelling operation are **one harmonious whole**, while carnality natively tends to mere multitudinousness, distraction, chaos, in life's outgoings and impulses. *Of the Spirit:* unquestionably **the Personal Sanctifier**; cp. John xv. 1–12. *Is love*, etc. The catalogue of exercised graces here, beginning significantly with *love*, ought to be studied as a panoramic contrast to the preceding catalogue of vices: "look on this picture and on that." In relation to both catalogues it is doubtful whether a rigorous logical classification is competent as an exhibition of the working of Paul's mind here. But in the present case, of the graces, there is some such articulate movement as this:— 1. **Inward graces**, viz. *Love, joy* (simply from **happy consciousness** of life, such as makes a child to sing), *peace* (**felt absence of disturbance, felt presence of harmony**, in heart and in state towards God and man). 2. **Graces toward man**, viz. *Long-suffering* (**magnanimous forbearance**), *gentleness* ("**graciousness**," **bonhomie** in a noble sense), *goodness* (the highest thing represented by the expression, "**a good fellow**"), *faith* (here = **loyalty and trustfulness**). 3. *A more generic form of the graces under* 1., viz. *Meekness* (**mild equanimity**, especially in the sense of **quiet submissiveness to God**, which results in a corresponding temper towards man), *temperance* ("**continence**" in a wide sense = **rational restraint of natural impulses**).

23. *Against such there is no law:* lit. **against things like these law is not.** Of course not. But the statement is saved from platitude by its connection with *ye are not under the law* in ver. 18 (see note).

24. *And they . . . lusts. And they:* **now they**, or **but they**, resuming, argumentatively. *They that are Christ's:* a better reading, **Christ Jesus's.** *Have crucified the flesh*, lit., and perhaps better, **did crucify the flesh**—when they became Christ's (see ii. 19, 20, with notes). Here see that it is **on the cross** (of Christ) that carnality is slain. Hence, even in order to sanctification, the vital importance of Paul's doctrine of justification, which nails men on the cross. Observe from this point onward how often THE CROSS comes into view. *The flesh* here is manifestly **not human nature, but**, as set forth in vers. 19–21, **depraved human nature**, or the **depravity of man** as sinful: "carnality, once a man believes on Christ, has received its death-blow; it is nailed on His cross, and is surely, though it should be slowly, dying." *The*

25 affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk
26 in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain-glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

affections and lusts (*the* = of the flesh) = depraved susceptibilities and vicious propensities. The *affections* refer to the general frame of mind, and *the lusts* to special proclivities or habits.

25. *If we live . . . walk in the Spirit:* since we live in Spirit, in Spirit let us walk. No doubt Spirit here (see 18, with note on "Spirit") is the Personal Sanctifier. The *live* is indicative: it is assumed as a fact that Christians *live in the Spirit,—i.e.* that He, in the strict evangelical sense of the term, is the Spirit of their life (see Phil. ii. 13). *Let us walk in* (*the*) *Spirit* = let us walk accordingly, exercising or living this life of God in us, —let this be our walk. See above notes on "walk" and "fulfil" in ver. 16. The word for *walk* here is not the word there. There it is lit. going about—a picture of one's ordinary occupations and recreations. Here it is steadily progressing, or marching, as if towards a purposed end. *In the Spirit*, correspondingly, is = on the line suggested by the Spirit.

26. *Let us not . . . one another.* Some would have this verse placed in chap vi., descriptive of particular duties. It is probably best here, because the particular injunction in this sentence has a manifest general bearing on the whole controversy and temper with which Paul is dealing, so as to be a natural and significant winding-up of his statement about flesh and Spirit. Then the *brethren* in vi. 1 marks a new beginning from the point thus made.

Let us not, etc. Here is one very pertinent illustration of walking in the Spirit. *Desirous of vainglory:* vainglorious (either in the way of love of show, sensuousness, in form of religion, vi. 12, or) in the way of seeking visible superiority over others;—a caution which, in such a time of controversy, is worth attending to by the loyal evangelicals as well as by the Judaising legalists. *Provoking one another:* challenging one another. The word occurs only here in the N. T., but the meaning is plain. (As contrasted with vanity's provocation here, see about love's provocation in Heb. x. 24, where the Greek word is different.) *Envying one another:* not only (provoking) challenging others to contend for the palm of superiority, but hating them for what superiority they may now have. (See, on the other hand, 2 Cor. ix. 2. Where vanity breeds withering envy, love can have wholesome emulations.)

They which do such things cannot enter the kingdom of God: How, then, can any one be saved, seeing that we all are sinners in practice?

Fornication: Illustrate the implied condemnation here by contrast of heathen morality and religions.

Sorcery: Find illustrations of a hankering after "the black arts," (1) generally in the Eastern world, (2) specially in Galatia.

Why is "hatred" not placed first of the vices, as "love" is placed first of the graces?

CHAPTER VI.

1 BRETHREN, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; con-

(6.) On Relative Duties (vi. 1–10).

As contrasted with vainglorious egotism, there is here set forth true spirituality, specially in relation to two cases, of an equal and of a superior.

1. *Brethren:* the frequency of this kindly form of address is henceforward discontinued, the pathetic urgency it represents being no longer needed: the victory is won, and there remains only the distribution of the spoil.

1-5. *If a man . . . burden.* **First case** for application of the principle (v. 23–26), true spirituality *versus* vainglorious egotism.

1. *If a man be overtaken in a fault:* **even if a human being be caught "red-handed" in any transgression.** The word for *man* here = **human being,** is fitted, if not intended, to remind us, *humanum est errare.* The word for *overtaken* might be rendered as in our version, with the meaning that his transgression is the result of some sudden and overpowering gust of evil impulse. The rendering I have suggested, equally consistent with the Greek, seems more fully consistent with the strain of exhortation. *A fault* is decidedly inadequate: **transgression** (see notes on "transgressor" in ii. 18, and "transgressions" in iii. 19, where the Greek word is the same as here) is = **overt act** of sin. *A*, better **any,** means, **a given** transgression, **this** or **that** overt act of sin. *If* in our version hardly lays due emphasis here: **even though.** (Not only beware of arrogant egotism in ordinary cases, but **even in this strong case,** etc.)

Ye which are spiritual. Not necessarily **you who have stood true to evangelism** in this sifting time; nor necessarily **such of you as really have the Spirit** among churches that are apostatizing. Paul addresses churches as communities of "saints," disregarding the fact that individual members may be far from deserving that description. It is quite in his manner now to speak to the Galatian churches indiscriminately, presuming that all members are in Christ: **ye the spiritual, ye quâ spiritual: "supposing** you will walk in the Spirit, then," etc.

Restore such an one . . . meekness. Restore: **set him on his feet again, set him right** (as when a dislocated limb is rightly set). *In the Spirit of meekness:* lit. **in spirit of meekness.** "In a meek spirit" is justly scorned as silly by generous commentators. In connection with v. 25, and the whole surroundings here, *the Spirit* must be understood as fundamentally **the Personal Sanctifier.** *Of meekness:* observe, v. 23, that *meekness* has been set forth as one of the fruits of the Holy Ghost in man's heart and life. Also, that it is characteristic of Christ in relation to sin-laden souls (Matt. xi. 29). Observe also that this heavenly temper is strongly contrasted with that often exhibited, in like relation, by men who reckon themselves eminently "spiritual": the arrogant harshness of fanaticism thus illustrates real evangelism by contrast. (See about the elder brother in Luke xv.)

Considering thyself: **looking at thine own self.** People looking at a picture become aware, every one, that the picture is looking at *him.* So this great orator **individualizes.**

Lest thou also be tempted: **lest (haply) even thou be tried** (see 1 Tim. iii. 6).

2 sidering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one
3 another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. For if a
man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he
4 deceiveth himself. But let every man prove his own work,
and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and

2. *Bear . . . Christ. One another's* is very strongly emphatic here, both by position and by the strain of the passage: it is a powerful stroke, as with an axe in the hand of a giant, at censorious or vainglorious egotism, thinking of self, self, self: = *not* self, but **one another: of one another bear ye the burdens**—let *this* be your plan and practice of spiritual life. The word for *burdens* here is lit. **weights**, something heavy, oppressive (not like the eagle's wings, which are in a sense his burden, because he bears them). The most pathetic case is that immediately in view, ver. 1, the case of one under the piercing burden of detected sin and consequent shame. To bear *his* burden is heroically Christ-like. But the principle here laid down applies to all burdens that are heavy, oppressive, piercing. *And so fulfil the law of Christ. And so:* **and in this way** (**this** emphatic). *Fulfil:* of about equal textual authority is, **ye shall fulfil**, leaving the meaning substantially unchanged. The word for *fulfil* here is stronger than that in v. 14: it is = (lit. *fill* up) **thoroughly** *fulfil. The law of Christ. Law* here is significant: "if you *will* have law in your religion, *here* is a law for you." *Of Christ:* not necessarily **in the matter of it** distinct from "the law" of Moses (*e.g.* in the Decalogue). But **in the spirit** of it, as explained by Christ Himself (John xiii. 34), made as if it had been a new thing (1 John ii. 7, 8) by the wondrous new setting in which Emmanuel, especially by His death (Eph. iv. 32–v. 2), has set that love which is the root-principle of the law, even as given by Moses.

3. *For if . . . himself. A man:* **any one.** *Think himself:* **seem** (to himself), see ii. 6, with note on "seemed." *To be something:* = if *self* be in one's mind as worth thinking of; if there be the least conceit of self, *e.g.* in the shape of saying, when a brother is caught in a fault, "*I* am holier than *he* is." *When he is nothing:* **being nothing.** Paul here assumes that, in point of fact, **no one is anything**, in the sense in which the censorious (fanatic) thinks that *he* is something: "no one of us sinful men has in himself an atom of reason for self-complacency." *He deceiveth himself:* the word here appears to have been made by Paul for the occasion. It means **not only deceit** (of self by self), but **deceit bred in the frame of a man's mind:** = he is misled by the vapours of vanity—in "the imagination of man's heart" (Gen. viii. 21). *Himself* is emphatic: **his own self**; he is a **self**-deceiver.

4. *But let . . . work:* **His own work let every man test.** The emphasis here is on *work* (his own) = **the practical outcome** (of *his* life of religion). *Prove:* **put to the test** (*e.g.* by seriously reflecting on its quality and quantity as measured by God's law). *Every man* here has the point of, **each apart**—(not comparing nor slumping himself with others).

And then . . . rejoicing. Then: i.e. when he has found **his own work** standing the test. *Rejoicing:* **boasting** or **glorying.** The word for *rejoicing* here has elsewhere the meanings I have suggested. Here it manifestly means something like **occasion for crying out "glory (to God)."** In this sense Paul could glory on account of things personal to himself (*e.g.* Rom. xv. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 9, 11). *Rejoicing:* here the Greek runs: lit. **the rejoicing = the desired occasion for (rejoicing).**

5 not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden.
6 Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him

In himself alone, and not in another: with reference to himself alone, not with reference to the other. The other here = one's neighbour, especially the neighbour caught in any transgression. The Pharisee in the temple (Luke xviii. 11) saw in his neighbour cause for glorying—"God, I thank thee," etc. = (Because *he* is black, *I* am white: the blacker he, the whiter I.)

5. *For . . . burden. For* = see that your occasion for glorying be in reference to yourself. *Every man:* here, again, individualizing and isolating: "As if no other man had been, as if I had been the only man, so must I think and feel in this transcendently important relation." (Suppose there had been no creature but me before the Holy God.) The word for *burden* here is not the same as in ver. 2. Good Greek scholars are not fully agreed about the difference—if any—in meaning. Probably the *burden* in ver. 2 means a thing involving painful pressure, while the *burden* here may mean only—"responsibility"—that which falls to one to bear, whether it be painful or pleasant, the thing laid on you and me. But the point here is, that every one has to bear his own burden, and that *the* thing which he has to bear is a burden properly *his own.* This is no reason why I should not, ver. 2, bear my neighbour's burden (of sorrow and remorse). It is an all-sufficient reason why we should not imagine that, because we do not happen to have our brother's transgression to mourn for and answer for, we have none of our own: that our not being black in *his* way makes us to be white. *Shall bear:* has to bear, is doomed to bear. *To bear* here is = to carry a load. But it is arbitrary to represent the time of this *bearing* as beginning with the great day of judgment. We all know that it begins with the doing of an evil deed (Gen. iv. 13), or with coming under an obligation.

6-10. *Let him . . . of faith.* Second case for application of the principle, true spirituality *versus* vainglorious egotism. This case may have been suggested by what is said in ver. 5. A Galatian may think in his heart, "Very well, if every man is to bear his own burden, then let the minister bear his own expenses of living." And Paul provides against this baseness by saying (*but*), in effect, Yes, but *you* must give him the means, as he has no means of his own (Matt. x. 9, 10), and is fairly entitled to wages from you (Luke x. 7), or at least ought not to be allowed to starve in your service (Matt. x. 10). No interpretation of this passage can hold water that does not proceed on the fact that Paul—no matter by what impulse led—is here (as in 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14) pressing upon his readers the duty of liberal support to their ministers, in the plain sense of giving them abundant means of temporal living. Observe that the churches (Corinth. and Gal.) on which Paul presses this duty are characteristically *vainglorious* (v. 26).

6. *Let him that is taught . . . him that teacheth.* The word for *teaching* here means oral instruction. It early (Luke i. 4) came in the Christian church to mean, appropriately, systematic instruction. *The teacher* here is manifestly the one set apart for the office of that instruction; and it is important to observe that systematic teaching (of *the word* = the revealed truth, specially, the gospel truth) here appears alone as ostensibly pertaining to "office" in the church. The Galatians, apparently, had no high officials who did not publicly teach the word.

Communicate . . . in all good things. Communicate: "go shares with."

7 that teacheth in all good things. Be not deceived; God is
not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also
8 reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap

If the minister's purse be empty, it is easy to see what is meant by the church-member's going shares with him in relation to temporal *good things*. The word for *good* here is not that in ver. 9 and in iv. 18. The word there means **absolute good**, high and transcendental. The word here means **what is honestly desirable** (though it should not be in any way transcendental).

7. *Be not deceived.* There is wanting here that part of the compound word in "deceiveth himself" (ver. 7) which traces the deception back to vapourish imagination. The word here is a plain one, meaning simply, **do not be deceived**: such a word as one would employ "at kirk or market."

God is not mocked. The Greek word for *mocked* here is very graphic, so that an expositor may shrink from giving the plain meaning of it. Its lit. meaning is, "turning up the nose." The idea suggested is that of a bargainer in a market, who has cheated his customer, and who thereupon reflects upon his own cleverness and the purchaser's simplicity with **a grin** of self-complacency. Many religionists really live as if they had so "taken in" the Omniscient. They have not done so. Even though *they* should *grin*, as if they had "sold" the universe, *God* is not mocked. He sees their impudence; he sees through and through their impudent pretences of godliness. It is striking how often in Scripture this self-deceit is connected with **money** ("deceitfulness *of riches*," Matt. xiii. 22). See the cases of Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, and Simon Magus; also of Balaam. A Romish priest once said that, among all the confessions of sin he had heard, he had never heard one confession of the sin of covetousness. A curious illustration of the tendency to self-deceit—in the way of *falsetto* spiritualism—is furnished by a very prevalent use of the great promise in Mal. iii. 10. That promise, of "opening the windows of heaven, and pouring us out a blessing" more than we can take in, is connected with a "prove me now herewith," which perhaps nine in every ten of earnest evangelicals understand as meaning attendance on prayer-meetings, or something else of that sort, but which really means giving money for the support of religious ordinances. This looks like disenchantment. In truth, disenchantment (see iii. 1) is what the Galatians need,—deliverance from imaginative sentimentalism into the plain heroic prose of real life. It is at first sight astonishing how much the first teachers of our religion insist upon plain commonplace duties. To thoughtful students of human history it is an incidental evidence of their divine inspiration. The man who says *corban* (Matt. xv. 5), when his parents are starving, is in a bad way. "Counsels of perfection," aiming above the moral law, usually land the counselled beneath it.

For whatsoever . . . reap. "What one sows, **the same** shall he reap"—a proverbial expression. To sow selfishness is to reap selfishness in its native fruit; and to sow love is (the only way) to reap the proper fruits of love. *That shall he reap*:=**he must reap**,—the result is **rooted in the constitution of things** under God (who "is not mocked").

8. *For . . . everlasting.* The word for *everlasting* here is elsewhere applied to death as well as life. It natively means, **during the epoch** in view; so that in Pagan writers it may be found applied to describe the present evanescent life. **The life everlasting** of Scripture means an epoch, having no end,

corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit
9 reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well-doing:
10 for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have

characterised by completed fulness of the life in enjoyment and in manifestation. *Life* (itself) here manifestly means the highest thing that can go under that name: not merely (*psyche*) that animal being which is common to man with the brutes, nor only (*bios*) "a living,"—what is common to all well-conditioned men, but (*zoe*) what is peculiar to the "sons of God," and is supremely exemplified in Christ, in whom "was life" (*zoe*, John i. 4). *To the Spirit . . . to the flesh.* In both cases what is here set forth is **the end or direction** of man's outgoing activity. It is easy to see what is meant by *sowing to the flesh:* it is **living simply with a view to those ends which are sought by man as fallen and depraved.** *Sowing to the Spirit* is not so simple in respect of interpretation. For working purposes, good Christians understand the expression as meaning, "spiritual works, in intention and quality, alone will be followed by spiritual good fruits to the worker." Whether *to the Spirit* here means that the soil into which the seed is cast must be a spiritual mind = the Divine Spirit in the mind of man, appears to be a question rather of dogmatic theology than of exegesis. **Living for those ends which are agreeable to the (indwelling) Spirit of grace,** is perhaps a fair representation of the meaning here. *Corruption:* = not simply **depravation,** but, **death** as the result of depravity. The Greek word combines the two meanings.

9. *And let us . . . faint not. And:* perhaps better, **but** or **only**: "not only do well, but keep at it." (See note on "continuing" in iii. 10.) *Be weary . . . faint not.* The two expressions are not made clear by the dictionary: their meanings must be ascertained mainly from the connection. *Be weary*, we shall say, is = **be faint-hearted,** in the sense of, **failing in pertinacious force of will.** Correspondingly, we say, *faint not* is = **proving slack in the end,** as one's work becomes discontinued for fruitful purpose whose heart in it has got broken! ("Tine heart, tine a'.") *Well-doing:* the *well* here is more comprehensive in meaning than the *good* in ver. 6. Here the reference is to all that is beautiful and noble in action. Paul's maxim here has a universal reference to excellence in action. ("In relation to this particular case, of liberality in support of the ministry, let us act on the universal rule, for moral action, **do not weary, keep up your heart at the work,** *a stoot heart tae a stey brae.*") *Faint* = giving up the work, as a reaper would on finding that he really cares nothing for the result: "for continuous vigour and zest in this process, we must have a sustained freshness of interest and hope relatively to the result." Hence the *for*, etc.

For in due season. (See 1 Cor. xv. 58, *and* the first clause of 1 Cor. xvi. 1.) The word for *season* here is in meaning like that for *due time* in iv. 4 (see note there). It means not simply duration, or protensive quantity of life, but **occasion, opportunity,** as determined by God. (So, "redeeming the time" in Eph. v. 17.) "There is a *time to reap;* and in that reaping time they shall have their sheaves who keep a strong heart, and so do not come to have a weak hand."

10. *As . . . of faith.* The *as* here is important = **since, or seeing that.** Then *we have* becomes emphatic = "since we *have*." *Opportunity:* the word here is that made *due time* in ver. 9 = "*Now*, for us, is God's good time, the

therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all *men*, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.

God-given season, for doing good," etc. *Let us do good:* let us be working at beneficence. (*Good* here, as in ver. 6, = what is honestly desirable, *e.g.* giving money to a minister.) *Unto . . . faith: To . . . to;* towards . . . towards. Let our beneficent activity, which has been directed to ministers, keep working out all round, with a *specialty* of interest and affluence in relation to *them who are of the household of faith.* The *specialty* (lit. = most of all) here is a commonplace (1 Pet. ii. 17). Christian philanthropy is not cold-blooded cosmopolitanism. But the point here is not simply, "*love* the brotherhood," but *do good* to them now, when you have the opportunity. *Of the household of faith:* the domestic persons of the faith. "The house" here has come to mean "church" (*kirche*, a Germanic abridgment of *kyriake* = "house of the Lord"). But in this text the reference is not only to "church" members in the ordinary sense. The stress is on *the faith* = the religion of Christians (see i. 23, with note on "the faith"). All who are in "the faith" are *eo ipso* a "brotherhood," with special claims on the beneficent affection of "spiritual" men. The "spiritual" men do not here need to exercise themselves anxiously about the possibility of an ostensible believer's being no real Christian. Paul (above, ver. 1) deals with all ostensible Christians as real; and our exercised love to men ostensibly Christian is not wasted though they should prove to be not real Christians: "charity is *twice* blessed;" and though there should be no blessing to the receiver, there is a blessing to the giver. (See "The Gospel according to Paul the Magnanimous" in Acts xx. 35,—the only "word of the Lord Jesus" not given for record to other God-inspired men, a "word" reserved for Paul, perhaps on the principle, *detur digniori.*) But the point of the exhortation here is, "Now is the God-given season: therefore let us be busily sowing beneficence in every way, and all round, with due regard to specialties of claim."

How does heroic tenderness and generosity, like that of King Arthur, tend to set a fallen man on his feet?

John Stuart Mill says that humility, the distinctively Christian grace, is incompatible with magnanimity. Is magnanimity coincident with self-conceit? If not, what does Mr. Mill mean?

*As to the proposition, "that ministers ought to be well paid and generously supported:" set forth—*1. *Antagonistic views of Christians professing to be distinctively "spiritual;" and* 2. *The word of Christ* (1) *as to* pay, (2) *as to* maintenance. *Why does Christ not think it low and vulgar to speak of "his (the workman's) meat" in this relation?*

Show from biography and history that "philanthropy" is not incompatible with, is compatible with only, warm affection to one's own house, and church, and land.

(7.) Conclusion (11–18).

Resumes and points the whole in a succession of powerful strokes, which constitute a grand burst of pathetic eloquence.

11 Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with
12 mine own hand. As many as desire to make a fair shew in
the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest
they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.
13 For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the

11. *Ye see . . . own hand. Ye see:* perhaps better, **see.** *How large . . . hand.* To what does Paul refer here: the whole letter, or only this conclusion? Probably the latter. *How large a letter:* better, **in how large letters:** the Greek form of words here appears to admit no other construction. *With mine own hand.* On any construction, Paul, whose custom it appears to have been not to write his Epistles with his own hand (see Col. iv. 18, and 2 Thess. iii. 18), here manifestly means to confer a special mark of kindness upon the Galatian Christians, as if for the purpose of softening his keen rebukes by showing them this unwonted personal attention. *To you* is somewhat emphatic. The *largeness* of the letters (as if "Capital Letters") *may* have been occasioned by the chronic infirmity of his eyes (iv. 13). Or it may have been occasioned by his desire, through bold, strong writing, to represent his clear conviction and resolute determination relatively to the matter now in debate. The suggestion that what he means is, **big, shapeless letters,** as if he had been a semi-barbarian trying to write in Greek (see Introd. p. 21), is excessively jejune. *I have written* (lit. **I wrote**): consistent with the supposition that he refers to only the conclusion; according to a well-known usage of **epistolatory past** (the writer placing himself in the position of those by whom the letter is received and is being read).

12. *As many . . . cross of Christ.* Here THE CROSS again (see note on "crucified" in v. 24). *As many:* **such (men) as** (he proceeds to set forth a **characteristic** of them). *Desire to make a fair shew in the flesh:* = whose purpose in religious life is to make a plausible appearance,—appearance which (of course) will be characteristically *in the flesh, i.e.* **outward.** The **reference to the body** in ver. 13, here not demanded by the dictionary (see note on "flesh" in ii. 16), appears to be excluded by the sense. *Constrain* (see note on "compellest" in ii. 14). *Only lest they should:* = **only in order that they may not.** This is their real animating motive (see note on "dissimulation" in ii. 13). *Persecution* (see note on "persecution" in v. 11). *For the cross of Christ.* THE CROSS again: here = **the religion of Atonement** by Christ's death, and so **of grace** (*versus* law) in justification and salvation. If only they get the Galatian converts circumcised, then they shall escape "persecution," not only at the hand of Judaising Christians, but also (in large measure) at the hand of unconverted to the Jews, whose hatred is (1 Cor. i. 22, 23) specially occasioned **by the cross,** as a symbol of effective abrogation of "the law."

13. *For . . . your flesh. For* = proof that **they are not simply sincere bigots** (see John xvi. 2), but like "the other Jews" (with Peter) in ii. 13, 14 (see notes there), self-seeking and cowardly,—**disingenuous.** *They who are circumcised:* the reading here is doubtful. Textual authority seems to be almost equally for, **they who have been circumcised,** and for, **they who undergo circumcision (or mix themselves up with circumcision).** The former reading points to born Jews of the circumcision faction, the latter to (also if not exclusively) born Gentiles who have gone, or are going, over to that faction, by submitting to the rite. Perhaps it would suffice to regard the expression as meaning roughly, **the circumcision-mongers;** that suffices for

law; but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory
14 in your flesh. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is

the apostle's argument: = "those who ostensibly make a religion of circumcision." (They are manifestly not in earnest, for) *neither they themselves keep the law:* **not even they themselves keep law.** They do not act out **the principle**, of law-keeping, which alone would warrant enforced circumcision (see v. 2, 3, with notes). *But:* **on the contrary.** "What moves them (*that* = **in order that**) is not sincere, though mistaken, enthusiasm for legalism as a plan of life. What moves them is this:"— (*They*) *desire . . . in your flesh. Desire* = **this is what they are bent upon.**

You and *your:* both emphatic. (What they really aim at is to make capital of *your* submission to legalism, to have tokens of their triumph in *your* flesh.) *Flesh* here: manifestly = **bodily part** of manhood. *Glory* (see note on *rejoicing* in ver. 4). It is worth observing how legalism tends to maltreatment of the body, even so far as to reduce the man into a ghost: *i.e.* tends to shallow sensuousness even in morality, transferring the seat of morality **from the heart to the mere corporeal frame.**

14. *But God forbid . . . the world.* On *God forbid*, see note under ii. 17. The *I* here is strongly emphatic: = **a vehement revulsion of Paul's religion** from the suggestion that a Christian should seek his cause for glorying in the flesh of a brother Christian, or in anything short of *Christ's cross;* which is here referred to with elaborate solemnity, of *our* Lord, etc. (*your* **Lord** as well as mine). THE CROSS again. *The cross of Christ* here—*Hoc vinces*—("Christ crucified" in 1 Cor. i. 23, and ii. 2), *i.e.* **Emmanuel in His Atoning sacrifice**, or in His whole redeeming work, especially of sin-bearing substitution as completed on the accursed tree (the crucifixion being the thorny coronation of His service in our stead, as well as the self-offering of the Great High Priest for our redemption unto God, Heb. ix. 12–14). *By whom:* some make it *by which* (= **the cross of Christ**). But though the Greek seems to permit this version (which it certainly does not demand), the *by whom* (= **Christ on the cross**) seems most fully in keeping both with the Greek and with the strain of the passage. *By* here = **through** (as in i. 1; see note on *by* there). *The world:* = **everything short of God.** Paul's contention from the outset has been that nothing short of God can be warrantably relied on for justification and salvation. But in v. 24 he has marked a decisive transition from *worldliness*, in the sense of controlling and reigning affection toward creatures, as achieved on the cross by those who are Christ's. Here he further emphasizes the same point as one realized in his own experience of religion as a Christian. *The world is crucified to me. To me* = **for me** (so far as regards power over me, as object of affection, compared with God, Ps. lxxiii. 25, 26; cp. 1 John v. 4). *Is crucified:* THE CROSS again. Not only the world has got its death-blow, but it has got it on the cross ("worldliness dies in my heart when I look on the world's Maker dead for me on the cross"). *I unto the world:* = **I (am crucified) unto the world.** THE CROSS again. The *crucified* is in the perfect tense = a thing **done, completed**, just in so far as I am a believer in the Crucified One (Eph. ii. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 18). To be *crucified unto the world* is **to be inwardly free from worldliness**—from that weakness or vice which makes men slaves to creature fascinations. But (see John xiv. 30) may not *the world . . . unto me* mean, further, that even the outward

15 crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ
Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircum-
16 cision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according
to this rule, peace *be* on them, and mercy, and upon the
17 Israel of God. From henceforth let no man trouble me: for

allurements—*e.g.* of ill company—are in some measure withdrawn when a man has decisively committed himself to the cross?

15. *For . . . new creature. For:* **the reason** for *God forbid* in ver. 14 = "If the matter had stood otherwise with me, then I should not have been *in Christ Jesus*." *Neither circumcision:* see note on this expression in v. 6. *A new creature:* **but new creature**, or, **but new creation**; it is evident that difference in version here would make no difference in meaning. "To *die* to the world, and have the world *dead* to us, is **the grand attainment** (in respect of affection) for us to whom natively the world is a killing tyrant, while we are its willing slaves." *A new creature. Creature*, as distinguished from "nature," in relation to the universe, marks **origination by free-will** of God Almighty. *New creature*, in relation to redemption, marks, in like manner, origination by free-will of God Almighty, supernaturalness of origin, such as in the typical cases of Isaac and of Jesus. The effect of this new creation is practical holiness, purity, and love in heart and life (Eph. ii. 10), which, at the same time, is the great end of God in our redemption (Eph. i. 4). In relation to this, mere externalism of any sort, whether in itself legitimate or not, counts as nothing.

16. *And as many . . . of God. As many:* **such (men) as** (see note on "as many" in ver. 12). *This rule:* lit. **this straight line**, *e.g.* of a mason's straight-edge, or a surveyor's chain,—marking **direction**: the direction indicated by Paul in saying, **through Christ crucified** I make the great attainment of deliverance from worldliness.

Peace . . . mercy. Peace is what is **nearest in the experience** of Christians; *mercy* is **the more remote source** of this peace. *And upon the Israel of God:* substantially this clause means, **namely, to the Israel of God.** God's Israel (see Phil. iii. 3; and study the reasoning about the true Israel in Rom. ix.–xi.; marking ix. 6, 7, and xi. 26) with Paul, as we see (*e.g.*) in his whole reasoning in chap. iii., consists of **believers**, to the exclusion of all distinction between Jews and Gentiles. (See note on "Jews" in ii. 15.)

17. *From henceforth . . . Jesus. From henceforth:* = **all through the following time** (*e.g.* after he has unburdened his mind in this letter). Our translators are correct in making the reference strictly to **time.** *Trouble me:* **inflict insults and annoyances on me.** *For I bear . . . Jesus.* The logic = (or rhetoric) here is singularly powerful. *Marks* are (*stigmata*) *scars*, or other bodily evidence of violence undergone. *Paul* has undergone these violences, and bears the traces of them, not through mere *falsetto* asceticism, nor through quixotic enthusiasm, but strictly **in** the way of his life's labour and battle as **a** soldier of Christ: "each dint upon his battered shield was token of a foughten field." *Marks* (of this sort) *in the body* (literally) have been found on **religionists** (as showing what demon they are addicted to), on **criminals** (as branding them ineffaceably with the token of their crime), and on **slaves** (as on sheep) as showing **whose property** they are; as well as on **soldiers** (and **sailors**), who occasionally make an indelible mark on their flesh significant of their devotion to their commander. Paul's **very flesh** has marks

18 I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus. Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your spirit. Amen.

of *his* being the slave of Jesus. (Gillies, a Highland *ecclesiastical* name, has exactly this meaning.) Hence the argument (let no one torment me, for I am branded as the Lord's). Perhaps *the Lord* ought not to stand here. The textual authority is not conclusive. And the strain of the passage would be well satisfied by having simply *Jesus* ("Jesus of Nazareth is the Proprietor of me, Paul—witness these scars;" see Phil. ii. 9–11). The scars, or *marks*, observe, were *on his body*.

18. *Brethren . . . Amen.* On *Amen*, see note under i. 5. *Brethren* is in the Greek the last word in this closing sentence of the conclusion; as if Greatheart had meant to say, "After all, my last word is, I love you, I love you." *Your spirit:* it is frivolous to make this refer back to contrast with *body* or *flesh*. He manifestly means, in the profoundest sense, "May there be with you, loved brothers, *the* grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."

THE END.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN.

(SEVENTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES.)

By JOHN LAIDLAW, D.D.

'An important and valuable contribution to the discussion of the anthropology of the sacred writings; perhaps the most considerable that has appeared in our own language.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'The work is a thoughtful contribution to a subject which must always have deep interest for the devout student of the Bible.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'Dr. Laidlaw's work is scholarly, able, interesting, and valuable. . . . Thoughtful and devout minds will find much to stimulate, and not a little to assist. their meditations in this learned and, let us add, charmingly printed volume.'—*Record.*

In demy 8vo, price 9s.,

THE TRUTH OF SCRIPTURE,

IN CONNECTION WITH

REVELATION, INSPIRATION, AND THE CANON.

By Rev. Professor GIVEN, Magee College.

'An exceedingly fresh and full discussion of the preliminary questions of theology. . . . Every point is duly argued out. The consequence of this proportionate treatment is that the whole discussion is marked by great symmetry. The entire evidence, upon which the immemorial faith of the Church rests on these vital questions, is here presented to the reader.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

'A noble volume. An armoury of weapons of defence against sceptical objections.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

'I commend this elaborate and learned work to the attention of earnest minds.'—*Church Bells.*

In One Volume, 8vo, price 12s.,

FINAL CAUSES.

By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute, Paris.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY WILLIAM AFFLECK, B.D.

This very learned, accurate, and, within its prescribed limits, exhaustive work. . . . The book as a whole abounds in matter of the highest interest, and is a model of learning and judicious treatment.'—*Guardian.*

'Illustrated and defended with an ability and learning which must command the reader's admiration.'—*Dublin Review.*

'A great contribution to the literature of this subject. M. Janet has mastered the conditions of the problem, is at home in the literature of science and philosophy; . . . in clearness, vigour, and depth it has been seldom equalled, and more seldom excelled, in philosophical literature.'—*Spectator.*

'A wealth of scientific knowledge and a logical acumen which will win the admiration of every reader.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

WORKS BEARING ON THE

LIFE AND PERSON OF CHRIST,

PUBLISHED BY

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

Nicoll (*W. R., M.A.*)—*The Incarnate Saviour: A Life of Jesus* Christ. Crown 8vo, 6s.

'It commands my warm sympathy and admiration. I rejoice in the circulation of such a book, which I trust will be the widest possible.'—*Canon Liddon.*

Lange (*J. P., D.D.*)—*The Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Edited*, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Second Edition, in Four vols. 8vo, Subscription price 28s.

Stalker (*Jas., M.A.*)—*A Life of Christ. Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

'No work since "Ecce Homo" has at all approached this in succinct, clear-cut and incisive criticism on Christ, as He appeared to those who believed on Him.'—*Literary World.*

'As a succinct, suggestive, beautifully written exhibition of the life of our Lord, we are acquainted with nothing that can compare with it.'—*Christian World.*

Naville (*Ernest*)—*The Christ. Seven Lectures. Translated by Rev.* T. J. DESPRÉS. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

'Ministers who wish for suggestions and guidance as to the manner in which they can treat of the pressingly important subject which is considered by M. Naville, should take pains to acquaint themselves with this volume.'—*Christian World.*

Caspari (*C. E.*)—*A Chronological and Geographical Introduction to* THE LIFE OF CHRIST. 8vo, 9s.

'No Bible student should fail to make this treatise his constant friend and companion.'—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

Bruce (*A. B., D.D.*)—*The Training of the Twelve; or, Exposition* of Passages in the Gospels exhibiting the Twelve Disciples of Jesus under Discipline for the Apostleship. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

'A really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject; a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

Bruce (*A. B., D.D.*)—*The Humiliation of Christ, in its Physical,* ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

'This noble theological treatise.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

Smeaton (Professor)—The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught by CHRIST HIMSELF. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

'We attach very great value to this seasonable and scholarly production.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

Stier (Dr. Rudolph)—On the Words of the Lord Jesus. Eight vols. 8vo, £4, 4s. Separate volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.

In order to bring this valuable Work more within the reach of all Classes, both Clergy and Laity, Messrs. Clark continue to supply the Eight Volume Edition, bound in FOUR, *at the Original Subscription price of* £2, 2*s.*

'Every page is fretted and studded with lines and forms of the most alluring beauty. At every step the reader is constrained to pause and ponder, lest he should overlook one or other of the many precious blossoms that, in the most dazzling profusion, are scattered around his path.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

Ullmann (Dr. Carl)—The Sinlessness of Jesus: An Evidence for Christianity. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

'Ullmann has studied the sinlessness of Christ more profoundly, and written on it more beautifully, than any other theologian.'—Canon FARRAR, in his *Life of Christ.*

Ebrard (Dr. J. H. A.)—The Gospel History: A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Four Gospels. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

'Nothing could have been more opportune than the republication in English of this admirable work.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)—The Miracles of Our Lord: Examined in their relation to Modern Criticism. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

'Will take its place among the best recent volumes of Christian evidence.'—*Standard.*

Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)—The History of the Passion and Resurrection OF OUR LORD, considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

'Will well repay earnest study.'—*Weekly Review.*

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—The Suffering Saviour; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

'To the devout and earnest Christian the volume will be a treasure indeed.'—*Wesleyan Times.*

Dorner (Professor)—History of the Development of the Doctrine of THE PERSON OF CHRIST. Five vols. 8vo, £2, 12s. 6d.

'So great a mass of learning and thought so ably set forth has never before been presented to English readers, at least on this subject.'—*Journal of Sacred Literature.*

WORKS BY PATON J. GLOAG, D.D.

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES

(*Being the 'Baird Lecture' for* 1879).

'We regard Dr. Gloag's book as a valuable contribution to theological literature. We have not space to give the extended notice which its intrinsic excellence demands, and must content ourselves with cordially recommending it.'—*Spectator.*

'For its thoroughness it is a perfect pleasure to get hold of such a book; and amid the shallow scepticism which prevails, we hail its appearance as a much needed antidote, and a strong and convincing demonstration of the faith once delivered to the saints.'—*English Independent.*

In demy 8vo, price 12s.,

INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

'This introduction to St. Paul's Epistles is a capital book, full, scholarly, and clear; . . . no difficulty is shirked or overlooked, but dealt with fairly and in an evangelical spirit. To ministers and theological students it will be of great value.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

'A safe and complete guide to the results of modern criticism.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'Altogether it is one of the most satisfactory books we have on the themes it discusses.'—*Freeman.*

In Two Volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s.,

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

'The Commentary of Dr. Gloag I procured on its first appearance, and have examined it with special care. For my purposes I have found it unsurpassed by any similar work in the English language. It shows a thorough mastery of the material, philology, history, and literature pertaining to this range of study, and a skill in the use of this knowledge which (if I have any right to judge) place it in the first class of modern expositions.'—H. B. Hackett, D.D.

'Dr. Gloag's work is very acceptable. . . . The volumes are scholarly, earnest, trustworthy, and supply materials for the refutation of the speculations of the critical school.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

PROFESSOR GODET'S WORKS.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 31s. 6d.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

By F. GODET, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, NEUCHATEL.

'This work forms one of the battle-fields of modern inquiry, and is itself so rich in spiritual truth, that it is impossible to examine it too closely; and we welcome this treatise from the pen of Dr. Godet. We have no more competent exegete; and this new volume shows all the learning and vivacity for which the author is distinguished.'—*Freeman.*

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND FRENCH EDITION.

'Marked by clearness and good sense, it will be found to possess value and interest as one of the most recent and copious works specially designed to illustrate this Gospel.'—*Guardian.*

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

A COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

'We prefer this commentary to any other we have seen on the subject. . . . We have great pleasure in recommending it as not only rendering invaluable aid in the critical study of the text, but affording practical and deeply suggestive assistance in the exposition of the doctrine.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'Here indeed we have rare spiritual insight and sanctified scholarship.'—*Weekly Review.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

TRANSLATED BY THE HON. AND REV. W. H. LYTTLETON.

'Will at once take rank with the ablest works on Christian evidences. . . . The work, wherever known, must be appreciated.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

WORKS BY DR. J. A. DORNER.

In Three Volumes, 8vo, price 10s. 6d. each,

(*Vols. I. and II. now ready*),

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

'A monument of thoughtfulness and labour.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'Dorner's "System of Christian Doctrine" is likely to prove, when completed, his most masterly and profound work. . . . Great thanks are due to Mr. Cave for the pains and the skill he has so conscientiously expended on this magnificent work.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

In Five Volumes, 8vo, price £2, 12s. 6d.,

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

'So great a mass of learning and thought so ably set forth has never before been presented to English readers, at least on this subject.'—*Journal of Sacred Literature.*

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

HISTORY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY,

PARTICULARLY IN GERMANY,

VIEWED ACCORDING TO ITS FUNDAMENTAL MOVEMENT. AND IN CONNECTION WITH THE RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE.

With a Preface to the Translation by the Author.

'This masterly work of Dr. Dorner, so successfully rendered into English by the present translators, will more than sustain the reputation he has already achieved by his exhaustive, and, as it seems to us, conclusive *History of the Development of Doctrine respecting the Person of Christ.*'—*Spectator.*

Professor LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In three handsome crown 8vo volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.'—*Weekly Review.*

Apologetic Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity.

Fifth Edition. By C. E. Luthardt, D.D., Leipzig.

Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity.

Fourth Edition.

Apologetic Lectures on the Moral Truths of Christianity.

Third Edition.

In demy 8vo, price 9s.,

St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel.

Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. Gregory, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy Appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The Indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.'—*Guardian.*

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner.

The Church: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position.

'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.'—*Record.*

Just published, Second Edition, demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.,

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE;

OR,

EXPOSITION OF PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS EXHIBITING THE TWELVE DISCIPLES OF JESUS UNDER DISCIPLINE FOR THE APOSTLESHIP.

BY

A. B. BRUCE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

'Here we have a really great book on an important, large, and attractive subject—a book full of loving, wholesome, profound thoughts about the fundamentals of Christian faith and practice.'—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review.*

'It is some five or six years since this work first made its appearance, and now that a second edition has been called for, the author has taken the opportunity to make some alterations which are likely to render it still more acceptable. Substantially, however, the book remains the same, and the hearty commendation with which we noted its first issue applies to it at least as much now.'—*Rock.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Just published, in demy 8vo, Second Edition, price 10s. 6d.,

THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST,

IN ITS PHYSICAL, ETHICAL, AND OFFICIAL ASPECTS.

SIXTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES.

'These lectures are able and deep-reaching to a degree not often found in the religious literature of the day; withal, they are fresh and suggestive. . . . The learning and the deep and sweet spirituality of this discussion will commend it to many faithful students of the truth as it is in Jesus.'—*Congregationalist.*

'We have not for a long time met with a work so fresh and suggestive as this of Professor Bruce. . . . We do not know where to look at our English Universities for a treatise so calm, logical, and scholarly.'—*English Independent*

John Newport